

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XIV
NUMBER 7

SEPTEMBER, 1906

WHOLE
NUMBER 137

THE VITAL IN TEACHING SECONDARY ENGLISH¹

WILLIAM MORSE COLE
South High School, Worcester, Mass.

Though there are many disputed points in rhetoric, I believe one point about which all agree is the need of unity. Unless I can show you a unifying principle connecting our questions sent out in January with the main theme of our report today, I am sure that you will assert that we do not practice what we ought to preach. I am consequently forced into the rather unfortunate position of one who must offer you a whole system—a philosophy of the teaching of English, so to speak. This sounds alarming, I must admit; but my system, if I may use so portentous a word modestly, is extremely simple.

In another respect, too, I am placed in an unfortunate position. I expected to report upon other people's theories and methods; but the answers to my questions were so few that I have not much of the information that I expected to offer. A few persons answered my February questions carefully and freely, and to these persons I am extremely grateful. Their kindness is not the less appreciated for being rare. Some of them agree with what I am going to say, and some, at least in practice, appear to disagree. I hope both classes will make themselves heard in the discussion. In default of information about what others believe and practice, I am forced

¹Read as a portion of the Report of the Committee on Methods before the New England Association of Teachers of English, March 1906.

back upon my own heresy; for heretic I think I must confess myself. What I have to propose is not, I believe, entirely new; but it is, I believe, seldom practiced. Otherwise I should have less reason for offering it to you. My only excuse is that to me it is so much *the* teaching of English, *par excellence*, that were it not so I should not be a teacher at all. In other words, this philosophy is with me, so far as my teaching is concerned, a life-and-death matter. You will then pardon any seeming exaggeration of its importance.

I fear I am one of the methodical people whose criterion for everything is largely the question whether the thing is worth while. Has the thing vitality? Has it any meaning for a human soul? If I cannot answer that question in the affirmative and find the relation of that thing to other things worth while, I confess I am not interested in the thing.

Before I apply the theory, I must make one preliminary proposition which to some will be heresy. It is this: So far as we of the secondary schools are teachers both of composition and of literature, we are teachers not of one subject, but of two. This will be made clear as I go on; but kindly remember that I am speaking not of colleges nor of elementary schools, but of high schools and, so far as conditions are the same, of private and endowed schools.

No method is of avail unless it bears relation to the conditions in which it must work. What, then, are our conditions? The average recitation group is made up of pupils of many types of intelligence, taste, refinement. It reflects the types around us. Our pupils embody all the phases of our conglomerate American life which we find hard in the first place to account for, and in the second place to reconcile to each other. Though our pupils are in "standing water," between childhood and maturity, we must not assume that we can therefore make of them whatever we will. They will turn out to be in the main what other pupils have turned out to be. Though perhaps they will be a trifle better, wiser, more skilful, and more appreciative, no revolution is to be looked for. In every hundred of our pupils, perhaps two will be professional writers, doing newspaper or hack work; the percentage of writers of literature is inconsiderable, of course. Perhaps ten in a hundred will have occasion a few times in their lives to write for publication: a doctor

or a scientist may publish a discovery or a report, a lawyer may find it desirable to present a plea to the public, and a minister may publish a volume of sermons (and I trust you realize that a sermon is not primarily a piece of writing, for a very good sermon to hear is often a very poor sermon to read). About forty in a hundred will write papers for missionary meetings or women's clubs, or reports for stockholders' meetings or governing bodies. The rest of the hundred, practically one-half the whole number, will write only letters—telling about Johnnie's mumps, or asking about Aunt Maria's new bonnet, or promising the shipment of certain goods, or fixing a price, or arranging a contract. If these statements seem to belittle our profession, ask yourself whether they are not true, and then be thoughtful and frank in your answer. I am not even belittling the importance of the letters that these people are to write, but I do wish to consider what are their needs in connection with the facts. Neither am I condemning these people to what you may call a narrow sphere. I am only saying that nature has made them that way—and though I cannot necessarily pick out the individual members of each class, the life around us shows that the facts will be those that I have indicated. Of course, we shall all agree that we cannot make writers of literature of any considerable percentage of our pupils. A writer of literature is always a poet—at heart—and the origin of poets is not now disputed. Yet I fear the assumption of a great deal of teaching of English has been that writers of literature could be made. Though the same truth with regard to hack writers holds in smaller degree, it still holds in kind.

What bearing has this upon our teaching of English? To my mind it is the fundamental consideration for any scheme of methods. Let us begin with composition.

The greatest good of the greatest number must be in any democratic scheme the end constantly held in view; but this does not involve disregarding the rights of any. Indeed, a slight wrong to one may be sometimes an evil worse than a slight wrong to many. Those who have in them the making of professional writers—even of writers of literature, however few they may be—make their rightful demands upon us, and to them we must acknowledge our duty. The duty is the more pressing for the rarity of the demand.

How, then, can we serve equally well the wants of such various classes? Only by making our instruction absolutely flexible. Individual instruction is of course the ideal, but it is not for us. We will not waste time talking about it. Yet even when we must take our pupils in classes of thirty or forty, we can make our instruction largely individual. This cannot be done, however, to accord with the plan of work laid down by most textbooks in rhetoric; and that is why I usually find such books objectionable.

What I shall offer today is a method of teaching practically without a textbook; for I believe our lack of flexibility is due largely to the fact that so many teachers abandon their classes to writers of textbooks who not only do not know the classes, but can at best teach only at long range. Work that one pupil is entirely unable to do, another finds so easy and obvious that it is not worth doing. Much of the work that most pupils can do will never serve many of them any useful purpose. Let me illustrate. Most pupils can, with sufficient instruction and drill, convert loose sentences into periodic, and *vice versa*; but if a pupil's feeling for language is so weak that only by long practice in making such conversions can he see the difference between the two kinds of sentences, seeing the difference will do him no good. In other words, to him the difference will never be vital, and he will never observe it unless a teacher is at his elbow to force him to do so. The same thing is true of the difference between weakness and force. Pupils who cannot without hours of drill comprehend and recognize the difference between weak sentences and forcible will get from the drill no good. In Miss Shute's report of four years ago she illustrated the principle admirably by the story of the boy who wrote "I have went home" as a notice to his teacher, for whom he had just written fifty times the sentence "I have gone home." For the average class, exercises on topic sentences, periodic, loose, and balanced sentences, weak and forcible sentences, unity of sentence structure, imaginative expressions, etc., etc., are but wasted energy. Pupils will write as they think; and most adolescents—like most adults—think loosely, weakly, incoherently. Such people can never write with discrimination. To be sure, the aim of education is to teach one to think accurately, and training in English is a part of that education; but to try, all

at once, by a process of drill in particular rules, to make a loose thinker accurate is to expect education to perform revolutions—and it does not work that way. Rules, to be effective, should not precede experience, but should grow out of it. The writing can never advance one step beyond the thinking, and to try by a sort of *tour de force* to get results without the evolutionary process is to get only artificiality and sham.

This is not saying, however, that periodic sentences, force, ease, unity of sentence structure, and such other devices and qualities, should be tabooed from the classroom. The best pupils have a right to know all we can tell about these things, and even the less keen should know what we mean by them. The practice, however, should not be to that end, but general; then, in criticism, the teacher can direct the attention of each pupil to such things as he can profit by.

Here, in a way, and as far as composition is concerned, is the heart of the system that I have to offer. Nothing should be written for a definite pedagogic purpose—with a prescribed end. All writing must have purpose, to be sure; but that purpose should appear not from prescription, but from results. I should hardly go so far as Mr. Thurber goes in his October pamphlet, however; for I do believe in requiring occasionally that a bit of writing shall be in the field of narrative, or of description, or what not—simply for assurance that each pupil shall try his hand in each field. Yet, even here, to assign a subject is usually to force our pupils either to be insincere or to write “an infinite deal of nothing.” I hardly know which is worse.

I dislike to be so heretical; but I can see, for me, no escape from my position. I am haunted always in teaching composition by the thought of purpose. Our aim should be always to help our pupils to do better the work that in after-life will be theirs—not someone's else work which they will not be called upon to do. If individual instruction is the ideal, the nearest practical approach to the ideal is absolute freedom of choice of subject and absolute freedom from arbitrary drill in the refinements of style. No one disputes that the way to learn to do a thing is by doing it. All the teacher can do is to help the pupil to see what without help he would not see. Many

things some pupils see without help; and some things other pupils will never see except in response to a stimulus applied by a teacher on each new occasion. Such application of stimuli is not worth while; for since the pupil will not have the stimulus when he gets out into the world, the teacher is wasting time in applying it in the school.

How does the teacher know what the pupil will respond to? He does not, usually. Here appears to be the danger of this free and easy system. The escape lies in the treatment of the themes after they are written. The logical conclusion of the matter is to read aloud and criticise before the class all themes written by it. The criticism should be based on the apparent need of the writer, and the best indication of that is the merit of the theme. An ungrammatical, wandering piece of work need not be criticised for weakness or for incoherence of sentence structure. The better the work, the more discriminating the suggestions of praise and censure. Thus each pupil is held always to a standard a little beyond that of his present accomplishment—a standard presumably attainable for him. In this way the teaching is apportioned among the various needs of the class in exactly the ratio of need. That is what I call the greatest good of the greatest number. Those who can rise to better things not only have before them the work of their superiors, but also have the benefit of the criticism which it calls forth. To be sure, the best writers may be bored by a criticism—perhaps repeated for the hundredth time—on the work of the poorest; but such is the penalty of greatness. They are less bored than both they and the poorest would be by drill that one group does not need and the other cannot profit by. Each group gets satisfaction of its needs in the proportion that its number bears to the total number.

Some teachers declare that they cannot find time for this theme-reading aloud. I should quite as much expect them to say that they cannot find time to read themes at all. The most profitable use of time can always be afforded. Of course, no class could endure for a whole class-hour the reading of themes on an assigned subject; but classes are always eager to listen to themes treated on the plan described, and they like to take part in the criticism.

It is obvious that the textbook on rhetoric or on composition has

under this plan fallen into the background; the teacher and the class take its place. Living people should have vitality such as no book can have. A textbook may say in vain that certain constructions are not clear or not forcible, but when a teacher and the listening class agree that in a specific case the writer has failed to make his point, the lesson is vital. There is still much that the textbook may do, however, for it may well, though not necessarily, furnish the exposition of what the teacher uses as a basis for his criticism, and it may furnish material for drill in grammatical correctness and in clearness—the only two matters in which I am willing to concede that drill, *per se*, is worth while. There, however, I believe that drill is even demanded. "There is no shuffling." All pupils can learn to be grammatically correct and clear, and drill to that end may be and should be arbitrary and unsparing. If our pupils get anything else from the textbook or from us, let us attribute it to the grace of God, and be duly thankful. All that we have any reason to expect from the average pupil is that he will write with clearness and with something approaching force and unity, and that he will do so fairly in narrative, respectably in description, and comprehensibly in exposition and in argument.

A corollary to the general principle is a theory that no writing on literary subjects should be required primarily as composition. For purposes of test, much writing about books is no doubt necessary. Yet, though it is desirable often to stimulate pupils to have something to say about books, such things, I am convinced, should be said orally. Writing on any subject about which a pupil has been reading, or which he "reads up," is sure to be influenced by that reading. "So much the better," you will say, perhaps; and so far I agree with you; but when we place such tasks before our pupils, we incur one of two evils. If what the pupils have been reading is good, it is presumably better work than they themselves could do. Then to imitate, to copy words, phrases, whole sentences, arrangement, is to make the work better than it otherwise would be—a desirable thing for the work, but sapping to the moral fiber of the pupil. To avoid the words, phrases, sentences, and arrangement of the original is to strengthen the moral fiber of the pupil, but deliberately to make the work less good. Sometimes, indeed, a pupil

would naturally say the thing exactly as the author said it, but is deterred by fear of plagiarism. The result is bad morals to those who are weak in moral fiber, and bad English to those who are strong.

The same principle applies to writing in imitation. The greatest aesthetic fault of our age is imitation—we have imitation furniture, imitation silk, imitation fur, imitation morals, imitation art, imitation religion; and now, for fear that our pupils will not get enough in this mortal span, we force them into imitation literature. In their imitation literature they give sham thoughts to arouse sham emotions about sham things, and then we crow over the attainments of this sham education. If in any case we deny that all this is the result of imitation, I fear we ought to congratulate ourselves on the good fortune of the escape rather than on the excellence of the method. Few elements of our education are more depressing than the ease with which our pupils gather exalted notions of their own powers; and few things stimulate such notions more rapidly than the fancy that they can do this or that or some other thing by simply imitating someone else. Imitation practically never rings true.

I know that the inevitable example of Franklin's imitation of the *Spectator* is at the tongue's end of some of you. If Franklin's success in life was due to any one quality other than perseverance, was that quality not originality? If anyone ever could be trusted with imitation, that one was Franklin. He could imitate Addison and Steele by the hour, and then do something as unlike either as the *Ladies' Home Journal* is unlike the *Atlantic Monthly*—only, and here my simile fails, practically as good. It is to be remembered, moreover, that Franklin adopted the imitation method in default of any other. With him it was imitation or nothing. He had no teachers.

Only one more detail about composition do I wish to inflict upon you. I have never heard or read anything but condemnation for the teacher who does not require revision and rewriting of most written work. I must take this opportunity to protest. From the lower grades to college, most teachers bolster their pupils so that practically never is a child put to the test of what he as an individual, by his own power, on his own responsibility, can do. No air of finality attaches to anything he does. The consequence is our

prevailing national disgrace—lack of responsibility, in politics, in business, in morals, in society. A mite given toward the correction of this evil is absolute finality in every piece of work handed in. Revision and rewriting should come not after the teacher sees the work, but before; the benefit of criticism should show in future work. I have said nothing of the waste of human energy in useless copying, copying, copying. Our pupils unquestionably waste a great deal of their time; but do we teach them better by making them waste more? We ought rather to show them that life is so full of things worth while that a dozen lifetimes could all be profitably spent.

Let no one think because this system has no prescribed rules and devices that it is easy and therefore must be bad. It is difficult just because it is flexible. The class-hour requires the teacher to draw on all his resources, critical, constructive, and sympathetic; for he must realize that these themes are not only pieces of composition, but also reflections of the life and the thought of his pupils—crude attempts at literature—which should be considered as true or false to correct ideals of life.

We may now turn to the second phase of our work, the teaching of literature. So far as the make-up of our classes is concerned, we have to meet here quite as various conditions as in the teaching of composition. We have among our pupils those who appreciate practically nothing but salient narrative, those who also appreciate intellectual vigor, those who add spiritual appreciation, and finally those who absorb all good things. Here, then, as in the teaching of composition, our only criterion for determining what to do and what not to do is vitality—but vitality for the class rather than for the individual, though the individual must never be forgotten.

I am forced to believe that we who teach literature are in great danger of forgetting what literature really is. Just because we teach it, we get a distorted view of it. It is rather audacious, "in this presence," to hazard a definition of literature; but I must do it tentatively, at least, to make clear my point. Literature is the body of written truth about life. It is truth—and therefore no lie is literature. It is about life—and therefore it is all vital. My definition is adequate, however, only when taken less for what it denotes than for what it connotes. If anyone tells me that *The Ancient*

Mariner, though a lie, is literature, I shall answer that it is literature just because it is the truth. It expresses some of the profoundest truths of human nature—and not merely in the famous lines that some wish to call its moral: throughout its course it shows the psychology of sin as all of us have experienced it. If anyone tells me that Shelley's "The Cloud" is literature, though it does not deal with life, I shall answer that it is literature just because it is tingling with life. To read that poem is to feel anew what it is to live—though the cloud seems absolutely remote from human life. The fact is that no writing has ever endured as literature that is not a revelation of what life means—reflecting man's relation to man, or man's relation to nature, or man's relation to God. Again, no writing has ever endured as literature that has not in it the element of inspiration—of revelation, as I called it a moment ago. This revelation is nothing but the power to see and to express the vital element in life. Indeed, in that word "vital" is the whole secret. Literature is the vital way of writing vital things. If the thing is not vital, it is not life; and if the way is not vital, the truth is not wholly told.

Why, then, do we teach literature? Let us rather ask reverently whether we are fit to teach it. We, as teachers of literature, have more responsibility than any other group of men and women in the world. The biggest problem of modern times is that of learning how to live in this America—not how to get a living, but how to live so as to do and think and feel the things best worth while. At our elbows are young people looking out upon this big problem, and seeing it through an atmosphere tinged with—with what? With illusions, the illusions of heredity, and of environment, and—praised be God for it—of idealism. We have in our scrip the truth about life. Shall we share it with these precious souls, or shall we rather tell them that Macaulay was fond of hyperbole and of antithesis, that Shakespeare's later plays have more light endings than his earlier, and that Tennyson's *cæsura* was constantly shifting?

A realization of what will happen to these young people after they leave school only enforces the principle. Will most of them read for literary appreciation, or for life? All admit that we must teach them how to read. Shall we teach them to detect a false

accent and a faulty paragraph structure, or shall we teach them to detect false motives and faulty ambitions? Shall we enable them to distinguish pretense from reality, or is it better to show them the difference between the grand style and the halting?

Where, then, lies our duty? Perhaps it is not always easy to determine what our pupils need. We hear a great deal in these days about the commercial spirit. We probably all agree that we should make literature an antidote to that. Yet how shall it be done? The commercial spirit seems to most people to have the breath of life; hence an antidote that is not vital is vain. Unless, then, we can make our literature at least as much alive as commercialism, we are destined to failure. Commercialism is not our national disease; it is only the symptom of the disease. The commercial spirit sweeps all before it only when men fail to see the truth about life. For hundreds of years our literary leaders have been trying to show us the life of the spirit; but we have been talking of meters and metaphors and movement, until there is no health in us. I love the *Idylls of the King*, but when I am reading them I don't care a farthing whether the cæsura is after the first foot or in the middle of the fifth! Do you? To be frank, I'd usually rather not know where it is; and I respect the boy or the girl who resents the intrusion. If you should ask me why the life of the spirit is so little reflected from the literature of our race into the lives of the men and the women around us, I should answer in honesty that I fancy it is in part because for many years teachers of English have made loathsome some of the noblest sources of inspiration open to our time. Too much of our work has been devoted to collecting "facts for the curious," and too little to gathering inspiration for the struggles of life. It is true, moreover, that for all our pupils there is some vitality in the spiritual element in literature. I never met one so gross that he was dead to all spiritual truth. Yet for how many can vitality attach to verse formulæ, the rhyme scheme of a sonnet, Shakespeare's obligations to the law, or the identity of the mythological personages in Milton's *Lycidas*? The so-called literary study of literature has no place in a secondary school. All young people are eager to know about life. When they see that the greatest literature contains the most truth, they are interested;

when they see, too, that only a great style can express truth effectively, style takes on a new meaning to them; and then the factors of literary appreciation are at work. A suggestive question from the teacher will bring response from the responsive and will help them to see literary charm; but nothing will avail for the inert, and a quest in appreciation is not only fruitless, but profane. The technique of style should be relegated to such a background as it occupies in the mind of any sane educated person who is reading not analytically, but naturally.

Now let us bring this down to a definite practicable scheme. A lesson assignment in literature should be what? So far as I can make out, it should be nothing but the designation of a passage to be read—or possibly committed to memory. I find rather common, however, assignments with notice that particular lines are especially hard to understand, or particular allusions are especially important, or particular ideas are especially significant. Two fundamental objections to such assignments are obvious. First, attention is focused on special points at the expense of the whole; emphasis is placed often just where it does not belong, and other things shrink, in the student's mind, into subordination. The lesson then becomes a clinic, the text a subject for anatomical demonstration, and vitality is lost. The second objection is even more serious. To designate what pupils need especially to consider is to deprive them of both the pleasure and the benefit of a voyage of discovery. Nothing is more important in education than learning to recognize one's own difficulties and one's own needs. Never will an average pupil learn how to read without aid if he must at every turn encounter some question or suggestion projected into the study-hour by his teacher. If our aim were specific knowledge about particular books, no better method could be devised; but I conceive specific knowledge to be the one thing which our aim is not. What the pupil has missed should be brought out in the class discussion and should show him how better to do his next reading.

Here I must protest against what I call the encyclopædia habit. Not a quarter of the allusions in literature should be looked up. Allusions are to give pleasure. No man, unless he was a teacher of English, ever used an allusion with a desire that it should be hunted.

I believe every writer of literature would shudder at the thought of an encyclopædia at his reader's elbow. Shall we teach a method that violates the very spirit of all literature? "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." We all know the delight of a class in an allusion that touches a responsive chord; but we all know the shrinking at an allusion that brings only an echo. If we treat allusions as of importance *per se*, those that are meaningless are either impediments or points of departure for digressions. They should be passed, or explained by the teacher. It is far better to read two poems of Milton or two essays of Emerson and skip the allusions, than to read one poem or one essay and look up everything. The charm of allusion springs from the fountain of wide reading, but it never can be pumped up for the occasion. Wide reading, which we can encourage by rational treatment of literature, will create the fountain.

I can conceive of no method or program for the classroom hour. The English period may be as holy as a religious service, or as hilarious as a farce, or as cozy as a chat. It is a bit of life brought almost bodily into the room and unfolding itself before our eyes, and pausing, where necessary, for us to "look before and after, and pine for what is not." Nothing is better or more interesting for young people than free off-hand talk about life. For example, a class recently reading *Silas Marner* was discussing whether Nancy was ultimately happy or not. These questions flowed naturally one from another: Did she deserve to be happy? What is happiness? Had Nancy every wish satisfied except the longing for a child? Does an unsatisfied wish preclude happiness? Does anyone ever get satisfaction of all his wishes? If so, is that person necessarily happy?—Here was practically a whole philosophy of life unfolding itself before the class—not directed by the teacher, but merely suggested through the Socratic method. All our literature is full of such possibilities. There is more religion in Dolly Winthrop's philosophy of faith, as expounded to Silas Marner anent the casting of lots, than in ninety-five out of a hundred sermons, and it is worth a class-hour. The best part of this class work is that it engenders the habit of talking about serious things and overflows into the outside conversation of pupils.

This work cannot be done if an air of haste is allowed to creep into the classroom. Haste is fatal to all literary enjoyment. Not only in the class but in the study hour one must have time to stop and think. A book not worth thinking about is not worth reading. Lessons should be short enough to allow for an atmosphere of leisure. The aim of the teaching of literature, someone has wisely said, is "a state of mind." A class that was recently required to read *Henry Esmond* in five lessons must have been in a state of mind indeed! The reading lesson should never be a task. Though many things in education should be done chiefly because they are disagreeable, nothing should be made disagreeable in order that it may be done. If you approach literature as a task, a coldness has sprung up between you and it. It withdraws its charm into a more congenial atmosphere.

I cannot resist the desire to protest against squeamishness. As literature is the truth about life, it cannot ignore sex, the facts of sex, and the problems of sex—to use a much-abused expression in a perfectly normal way. A person who poses as a teacher and is afraid of sex in literature is only posing—he is not really a teacher. One never need be afraid of the truth—and here, you remember, is the difference between literature and trash: literature embodies the truth, but trash is full of less—or half-truths which are worse. There is nothing to slide over in Henry Esmond's irregular birth, nor in Hester Prynne's and Arthur Dimmesdale's *A*. I never found a modest girl or an honest boy who failed to take these things rightly when presented truly. Innocence is not ignorance of evil; it is freedom from the experience of evil—in deed, wish, or thought. The surest protection for innocence is a knowledge of the basic truth. Silence is often harmful, for it often leaves unrevealed the truth that should be made plain. I admit that, though I am not squeamish about the whole truth, I am afraid of the grossness of such things as *She Stoops to Conquer* and *Hallowe'en*. They are not quite the truth about life, for they are distorted; and righting them is not quite worth while. Most of all, I am afraid of a study of Burns which is squeamish about his irregularities and fails to show what they were—how they grew out of his nature, how they marred or destroyed others' happiness, how they blotted his poetry,

and how in tragedy they ended his life. In the whole story of Burns there is truth; but in even an expurgated *Hallowe'en*, without the story of his life, there is a lie.

The *sine qua non* of good teaching of literature, then, is a knowledge of life with power to reinforce or make concrete the truths which our best writers have told. The teacher is the interpreter between the concrete world of today and the spiritual truths of all time. Because of the immaturity of our pupils, it is the teacher's great privilege to supplement their experience with his own and make literature vital. The world is the teacher's field; no phase of life should be unknown to him, and where he can go without corrupting his own soul he should actually taste it. He has no right to be ignorant, and therefore his education is never complete. Science, history, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, the drama, philosophy, and religion, claim him. Successful preparation for a lesson is rather less in a careful study of the text than in broad and deep living. No other profession requires so much experience, so much feeling, so much tact.

LITERATURE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS¹

KATHERINE H. SHUTE

Boston Normal School

The recognition of literature as an elementary-school subject, as a matter that shall be named in the course of study and provided for in the time schedule, is rather recent; and therefore we can hardly wonder that in some schools it has made no headway and that in others the conception of its purpose and scope should be most inadequate. We find every variety of attitude toward literature in the schools, from that of the conservative who regards it as a useless frill, a dangerous indulgence at war with the practical training that should prevail, to that of the sentimental enthusiast who looks upon the study of literature, with its inspiring ideals, as a panacea for all unrighteousness. And we find equally great extremes of policy on the part of our program makers, ranging from the course of study that gives no basis of selection and no word of advice as to the material to be studied, to the detailed program that provides for every month in the year if not for every day in the month. Somewhere between these extremes there must be safe middle ground; and the first step toward gaining a foothold on it lies in the consideration of what our aim should be in the so-called literature work of the elementary schools.

What are we striving to secure? Is it familiarity with a few standard pieces of verse and prose? Is it the ability to quote a goodly number of brief selections from English poetry, popularly known as "gems"? Is it the reproduction, in carefully constructed sentences, of *Æsop's fables*, the most hard-worked literary production in existence, with the possible exception of *Hiawatha*? Is it a knowledge in detail of the lives of some half-dozen American poets? Or is it the assurance that we are sending our boys and girls on with a liking for good books, the habit of reading them, and the power to

¹Read as portion of the Report of the Committee on Methods before the New England Association of Teachers of English.

find life and inspiration in them? And do we remember that in the grammar school "sending our boys and girls on" means, more often than it does not, sending them on not into the higher schools but out into life, and that in such cases if the taste for good reading has not been formed it is likely never to be formed? Nor can we take refuge behind the work that the public libraries are doing. They are doing magnificent work, but they cannot do it all and they must have the co-operation of the schools.

Those of you who have read a book published within the last year called "The Long Day," the story of a New York working girl as told by herself, have had brought home to you as never before the duty and privilege of the schools in this matter of good reading. The writer says:

I had opportunity for meeting many hundreds of girls and for becoming more or less acquainted with them all. Now, of all these I have not yet discovered one who had not at some time in her earlier childhood or girlhood attended a public school.

And yet in a chapter devoted to an account of the reading of these girls we find that the books they enjoy and discuss are practically all of the yellow-back variety. Not one standard novel, and what is more hopeless, not one simple, wholesome story appears among them all. Let me quote a few paragraphs, indicating their standards:

"What kind of story books do you read, then?" they demanded. To which I replied with the names of a dozen or more of the simple, every-day classics that the school-boy and girl are supposed to have read. They had never heard of *David Copperfield* or of Dickens. Nor had they ever heard of *Gulliver's Travels*, nor of *The Vicar of Wakefield*. They had heard the name of *Robinson Crusoe*, but they did not know it was the name of an entrancing romance. *Little Women*, *John Halifax, Gentleman*, *The Cloister and the Hearth*, *Les Misérables*, were also unknown, unheard-of literary treasures. . . .

I spoke enthusiastically of *Little Women*, telling them how I had read it four times, and that I meant to read it again some day. Their curiosity was aroused over the unheard-of thing of anybody ever wanting to read any book more than once, and they pressed me to reciprocate by repeating the story for them, which I did with great accuracy and with genuine pleasure to myself. . . . When I had finished, Phoebe stopped her cornering and Mrs. Smith looked up from her pasting.

"Why, that's no story at all," the latter declared.

"Why, no," echoed Phoebe; "that's no story—that's just every-day happenings. I don't see what's the use putting things like that in books. I'll bet any money that lady what wrote it knew all them boys and girls."

Certainly, this emphasizes a need in our public-school training that many of us have had occasion to feel keenly more than once; and in talking with elementary teachers I find a ready recognition of this need and a desire to meet it; yet the schools in which effective work is done in this direction are rare compared with those in which geography or arithmetic is well taught. What stands in the way?

In the first place, there is a traditional feeling that reading for pleasure and not for information is an indulgence and therefore not a duty of the school. There is an impression, too, that the homes take care of the general reading; this may once have been true, but it is no longer so in great numbers of families represented in our elementary schools. Again, the press of the so-called practical and disciplinary studies leaves little time for systematic work in literature. But I believe one of the most potent obstacles is the shibboleth of literature *per se*. The very term literature, with all its hallowed associations, has prevented us from doing for the children what they most need. *Little Women* is not literature, perhaps, and the "masterpieces" studied in the grammar school may be; but the habit of reading books like *Little Women* outside of school stands for more in a child's life than the most carefully chosen course of literature in school that has no effect upon the outside reading. If the outside reading remains unmodified, we have failed of our chief purpose. I fear that we teachers are sometimes deceived by the interest that our pupils appear to take in our literature lessons, and by their occasional expressions of appreciation. There is a delusive schoolroom interest that is easily mistaken for something more vital and enduring.

Last year a friend of mine who teaches the entering class in a city high school for girls, and who has the so-called commercial pupils only, asked her girls early in the year to write a paper on their outside reading. Of these ninety or more girls, all fresh from the grammar schools, the majority seemed to be very frank and genuine in their response. Of course one can never be absolutely sure of the trustworthiness of such statements, but the circumstances under which these papers were written and the ring of the papers themselves go far to stamp them as genuine. As samples of genuineness, take these two statements:

I do not like to read anything that contains anything about Botany, as I find it very dry reading indeed.

There is one thing I never do, and that is, read a book twice, except when I forget the story, or when I have absolutely nothing else to read.

Now in these very papers and in others bearing similar marks of genuineness, I find the following significant statements, showing how great a gulf may be fixed between the schoolroom literature and the outside reading even in the case of pupils who profess—and probably do take—enjoyment in the schoolroom procedures.

FIRST PAPER

Poetry I like ever so much, especially *The Lady of the Lake*. . . . There have been three or four books that I have liked so well that I would read them over again. They are Mary J. Holmes's books and their names are *Maggie Miller*, *Beulah*, by Clay, *Tempest and Sunshine*, and *The Browns*. . . . Every night after supper I read the newspaper. I like the funny section and I am always looking over the theatrical section. When there is a fire or murder I like sometimes to read them, but mama doesn't like me to read about the murdered things. I was very interested in the _____ account. (Here the name of a notorious criminal case was given.)

SECOND PAPER

I like good poetry. I very seldom read poetry at home as I never get out the meaning as well as in school, where the teacher explains it. . . . Every night I always read the tenth page of the *Daily Globe*, which contains a continued story, a short story, a "Boy's and Girl's Column," and the "Housekeeper's Column." The "Boy's and Girl's Column" often contains some very good literature.

THIRD PAPER

I like to read conversational poetry such as *Grandmother's Story of Bunker Hill*. I have read the story a great many times and enjoy the story very well. Another story I read was *Poor and Proud*. Another is *Bobby Bright*, both of which are very interesting.

FOURTH PAPER

In regard to poetry, I like some poetry but I never read such a beautiful poem as *Sir Launfal*. . . . I have read a great number of books and have read six or seven over once. Among those I like which I have read twice or three times are: *The Ghost* which is a grandmother's tale; three series of *Cricket*, another romance of a little girl who lived in a beautiful house in a country village; and *Ruby at School*.

A great deal of the grammar-school literature work with which I am acquainted is a study of poetry, and somewhat too largely it is

a study of the American poets only. It is not that this is not in itself good; it is not that the children do not find pleasure and profit in it; but the weakness in the system lies here, that the outside reading is unmodified. Good poetry—in the child's view—is for school with the teacher near by to explain; but out of school, stories are in order. Of course they are; the majority of grown people who read at all read fiction; why should not the children do the same? But because they do, and because the bulk of their reading in later years is to be fiction, the pressing question for us is—what can the school do to secure an interest in good, wholesome stories? It can, if necessary, take a part of the time now assigned to "gems" and "masterpieces" and devote it to this end. Great as the privilege is of opening, to as many as will enter, the door of the higher forms of literature, poetry above all, it is a greater privilege and a more urgent duty to guide the judgment and taste of the great majority in their choice of books for every-day outside reading.

Inasmuch as I am speaking as a member of a committee on methods, it may seem as if I had spent a disproportionate amount of time in sketching the aim of the work in literature, and as if it were high time that the methods were making their appearance. The fact is, it is not until one has a firm grasp of what he means to do, that it is possible to plan how to do it. Purpose *determines* method. Except as it grows out of purpose, method is a mechanical affair at the best. Nothing is more dangerous than that limited view of method which leads a teacher to feel that she has found the one and only way of doing any given thing. When a teacher sees clearly that her teaching of English will fail of its best opportunities unless there is a growing interest in books throughout her class, several things are likely to be true of her method. In the first place, she will arrive at a rational basis of selection and will make herself acquainted with enough good books for children to supply their immediate demands.

A rational basis of selection in planning a literature course for elementary schools is a matter to which much attention has been given in the last fifteen years: advocates of an ethical core, of a race-development core, of a chronological basis, of a strictly American basis, have not been wanting among us. Much thought and considerable experience have led me to believe that although successful

work may be done by following any one of these plans, provided the teacher is larger than the plan, the best features of each may be retained in a course built on the following foundation: (1) The predominate interests of the pupils must be recognized and gratified or our time is wasted, for if the children read at all outside of school, they will find material that will gratify those interests, and it will often be far from desirable in quality. (2) The total moral influence of the books and selections chosen must "make for righteousness." (3) The literary quality must be as good as conditions will allow; it may range all the way from the charm of Hawthorne's *Wonder Book* or of Lamb's *Barbara S.* to the unpretentious but attractive prose of Susan Coolidge's *What Katy Did*. (4) The course planned for a year or a series of years must have variety, proportion, scope. No one country, no one period, no one form of literature is enough: the American poet and the English, the ancient myth and the modern fairy-tale, the nature poem and the short story of real life, all have messages for our boys and girls.

And having settled upon a rational basis of selection, and having made herself familiar with material illustrating it, our teacher will find time for several other things; she will find a few moments each day for reading aloud to the class; she will lend the children books to take home and will put the numbers of public-library books on the blackboard; she will discuss with the children the books they are reading, leading them to express themselves freely, often reserving her own opinions, and, again, giving them when they will count. Her method will grow negatively as well as positively; there are certain things that she will not do: she will not call for much formal oral or written reproduction, for she finds that this defeats her main purpose; she will ask for a paraphrase only when that is the shortest and best route to the thorough understanding of the thing read. Above all, she will recognize that in order to understand the life in books, quite as much as to understand the life in the real world, children need guidance. They do not see the significance of things—why should they? It takes a world of common-sense to steer our way here. We must, ourselves, find life in the book; we must discern what, on the whole, it stands for; we must see what there is in the companionship offered in its pages, by which a child may

profit; and then, without being didactic, without labeling the virtues of the people portrayed, we must help children to appreciate them.

This whole line of effort may be greatly re-enforced by lending libraries. In a fifth grade that I visited not long ago, some thirty books from the public library were being used in this way and were in great demand. In another school, such a library, provided by public-spirited friends, is in constant use. In some primary schools, even, this good work is in progress. These books may or may not be literature, in the strictest sense, but certain fundamental things must be true of them all. If a third-grade child travels home with a book of old-fashioned fairy-tales under his arm, he has, so far as the subject-matter goes, a bit of real literature with him; whether the form is literary depends upon the version of the old tales chosen—and why cannot we have the best? A fourth-grade child selects Miss Jewett's *Play Days*; a sixth-grade girl, *Little Women*; an eighth-grade boy, *Treasure Island*; a ninth-grade pupil, *John Halifax* or *Ivanhoe* or *Silas Marner* or *David Copperfield*. A final adjustment of literary values may arrange these books on different levels, but in every instance the more important demands are being met—the books interest the young readers and their total influence is for good.

To dwell for a moment on the need of guidance—I have spent many hours in recent years in discussing books with young people; and I am frequently surprised that they get so little out of them. "But what did you think of the man who visited the children in the den and entered into their play as if he had been one of them?" I asked a young woman who had been reading Barrie's *Sentimental Tommy* for the sake of the study of imaginative childhood that it contains. "I don't remember it," she replied.

I felt very much as a man who kept a little picture shop in Canterbury seemed to feel when I said, pointing to a photograph of a strikingly beautiful detail, "Is this a part of Canterbury Cathedral?" "Yes mum," he replied, "didn't you see it?" "No," I responded apologetically, for I had spent the morning in visiting the cathedral. "Then you have not seen the cathedral, mum," he said with grave finality.

Too often it seems to me that my young friends have not "seen

the cathedral:" they have not lived in the book, they have not made the experience their own. They have passed a pleasant hour or so, pleasanter than if they had been learning a history lesson or solving examples in arithmetic; but they are not much richer than before. They drift on through a book as some people drift through life, making no close friendships, winding no "tendrils" such as Wordsworth speaks of, "strong as those of flesh and blood" around the books they read. The wise teacher lives in the book with the children. She finds out whom they like and dislike, why they feel as they do, what they would have done under similar circumstances, in this way making the life of the book real and a part of the child's own life.

Of course I have not forgotten the inevitable question, "How shall we make time for all this?" I have been grappling with that question too many years on my own account to forget it. Let me suggest a minimum possible to every teacher who cares enough for the cause to try a few experiments. (1) One good book may be read aloud in the course of a year, or—if we are dealing with little children—a dozen or twenty good short stories may be read or told; and many books may be lent, and a few of those most generally read may be discussed; (2) the teacher may read aloud one good poem every day, a *good* poem, for the greatest poets—unlike the great novelists and essayists—have much to say that children understand and love; it may not be a new poem every day, for some poems will be called for again and again; yet this practice may mean becoming acquainted with fifty new poems in the course of a year; (3) a few poems, eight or ten perhaps, may be studied and learned by heart; this may be done not only that the pupils may have the poems to keep but that they may recognize the difference between the thorough study of literature and a mere passing acquaintance with it; (4) and whenever the reading-lesson is a bit of standard literature—as is often the case in the reading-books now in the field—it may be handled with the insight and appreciation that literature deserves.

Suppose that not only one year but eight years of a child's life held these possibilities, can there be any doubt that his outlook would be larger, his days happier, and his inspiration to worthy living more potent and fruitful?

THE PROBLEM OF THE HIGH SCHOOL FRATERNITY

WILLIAM BISHOP OWEN
The University High School

The high-school fraternity has become a serious problem within the past few years. These organizations have sprung into existence and become well established under the eyes of school authorities, who have suddenly realized that they were called upon to deal with forces not easy to control, and less easy to remove from the sphere of school life. It is not surprising, perhaps, that the fraternities should have entered the secondary school so recently. The rapid development of our schools in the last decade, the increase in the total number of such schools and in the number of pupils in each school, and the rapidly growing number of high-school students entering our colleges readily suggest the explanation of this new phase of school life. The college fraternity, which not more than a generation ago was in many instances compelled to battle for its life, has become the model for the school fraternity. The college fraternity has become a recognized institution, meeting with little opposition on the part of college authorities. It is fair to ask whether this is likely to be the case, after a period of opposition, with the high-school fraternity. It would be hasty to infer from the result of the contest in the colleges that a like result will follow in the case of the schools. At all events, it is high time that those concerned with the management and development of our high schools should give a sober thought to this new problem, should try to deal with the question in a large way, and reach a solution that will be approved by the better judgment of educators and parents, and accepted as reasonable by the unprejudiced high-school pupils. It is the aim of this paper to point out some of the broader considerations in the light of which a wise conclusion would seem possible.

It seems safe for us to assume that the fraternity problem is a very real one for all connected with our schools, a problem that cannot be solved by ignoring its existence. Principals and teachers who are not opposed to the fraternity system in their schools admit the genuineness

of the difficulties connected with their control by enumerating devices, such as faculty supervision, which have proved adequate for the purpose. But the almost unanimous opinion against the high-school fraternity, wherever associations of teachers have expressed themselves on the subject, warrants us in assuming, for the present at least, that the fraternity is a problem for the teacher. The parents have not had the same opportunity for organized expression; but if the movement for the formation of parents' associations in connection with the schools continues, we shall not have long to wait for evidence from this quarter. Any school principal may be appealed to without hesitation for testimony on the part of individual parents that the experience with the new institution has features calling for a full measure of wisdom and firmness. One class of persons most immediately concerned with the effects of the fraternity on the school life will, it must be said with regret, in the present state of public opinion in the schools themselves, be slow to give organized expression to their views in the matter. A recent experience, where every effort was made to facilitate an unhampered expression on the part of non-fraternity members of a school, has convinced the writer that such students ought hardly to be expected to do more than to give individual opinions in mutual confidence. Sense of personal pride and a generous desire to avoid criticism of one's fellows are sufficient motives for maintaining silence under conditions where older heads often want the aggressive courage to protest. Fraternity members also have been free to acknowledge the faults of the system, although fairness leads us to say that the number is not large. Where, as has been suggested, teachers, parents, and pupils are conscious of a serious problem, we shall not go astray in assuming that we are discussing a vital question, and may proceed to consider whether the strain is but the healthy concomitant of a necessary adjustment or the significant evidence of the struggle of the organism to throw off a foreign and harmful element.

Within the relatively short time since the problem has begun to receive serious attention, various methods for dealing with it have been suggested, which may be roughly classed under one of three heads: the *laissez-faire* method, the method of indirect substitution, and the direct repressive method. The first two methods do not avowedly at least, aim at the extinction of the fraternity; the third meets the issue squarely

and would prohibit fraternities in the secondary school. It would hardly be necessary, in a paper which is concerned with the discussions of ends rather than means, to treat of these methods, were it not that each of the plans mentioned implies a characteristic view of the function of the fraternity in school life. It is worth our while, therefore, to get before us a clear idea of these views, with their implications, as a step toward the formulation of the standpoint of the writer to be set forth in following pages. Each method will be seen to imply certain views as to the nature of the secondary school as a social institution, and as to certain principles to be followed in the control of the schools.

The *laissez-faire* doctrine of the high-school fraternity states its position broadly in some such terms as these: The tendency of human beings is to form associations with their fellows. This instinct for fellowship manifests itself among the young as well as among the adult members of society. Boys organize clubs long before they reach the high-school age. This instinctive tendency is simply to be accepted as a fact to be reckoned with. It is a tendency, moreover, to be encouraged, as it leads to self-knowledge and results in much-needed social enlightenment. The aims and interests of boys are not comparable with those of their elders, and the elders are incompetent to provide suitable substitutes, and in trying to do so, they are in reality attempting to deprive the boys of the opportunities for social education which alone are effective. The whole modern movement in education is a protest against the endeavor to foist upon the young the matured point of view, the elaborated scale of values, of the teacher or the community. If the secrets, the emblems, the corporate success of his fraternity, so dear to the boy's heart, are in reality but trifles, they are tremendous issues for him; and in so treating them he is entirely within his rights, is forming his own standards; and this is the vital thing for him. Later on, in his own good time, he will come to discriminate between the essential and the merely accidental; will, because of, and not in spite of, his experience, enlarge his range of sympathy and interest, retaining, to be sure, a praiseworthy affection for his comrades of the charmed circle, but capable of passing a man's judgment on men and issues. The fraternity, then, is but one more instance of the working out of this gregarious instinct, located by chance in the school community, because association

with one's fellows is inevitable under the school organization; more definitely organized than were the youthful associations that the teacher looks back upon, but, after all, not essentially different, and not meriting particular recognition as such on the part of school authorities. From this standpoint, the duty of the authorities is clear: "Hands off." Of course, individual or collective violations of school discipline or the laws of good conduct are to be punished on their own basis; in fact, this is the only justifiable ground for any action against the fraternity or its members, because it lays the responsibility where it belongs, and does not confound the misdemeanors of individuals with the supposed evils of a system. If one fraternity maintains an organized opposition to good government in the school, eliminate the unruly member, thereby bringing to public consciousness the realization that offenders, whether individual or corporate, are justly dealt with on the basis of conduct. The unoffending fraternities will have received an object-lesson, and the cause of public order will be helped because of the just discrimination made. This, in the main, is the doctrine. It would doubtless be better stated and illustrated by its adherents, but its essential features, both theoretical and practical, have been touched upon.

The theoretical plausibility of this doctrine and the well-considered sequences of its fundamental articles ought not to blind us to its defects and omissions. Let us enumerate some of these. The first of these is the assumption that, because the social instinct is fundamental and universal, the fraternity is the proper "form" for its manifestation. We should hardly be willing to accept an educational theory that made the primal character of impulse and instinct an excuse for permitting them to express themselves without regard to their effects on the individual or society. Precisely this is the function of education—to guide and mold impulse into ways of usefulness; to provide the individual with criteria for the regulation of his impulses and instincts by reference to the results of his conduct on the well-being and happiness of others. In a word, the essence of the question is whether the fraternity is a proper form of social organization inside of a school. Certainly no one would maintain that it is the only form yielding legitimate satisfaction. Another serious defect in the *laissez-jaire* doctrine is the tacit assumption that the significant social relations

of the fraternity are within the group, affecting only its own members, while its outward relations are incidental and hardly a subject for discussion. Most careful observers of the workings of the system would maintain, I think, just the opposite view, that the effect of the organization on the school life is the significant thing in the problem, barring which its influence on the individual members might well be left to individual treatment. As we shall see later, the fraternities themselves recognize by their actions that the chief attraction in their system is the easily achieved distinction of standing out in bold relief from the background furnished in apparent acquiescence by the whole body of less fortunate fellow-students. But, from an educational standpoint, the most striking defect in this doctrine is to be found in its underlying conception of the nature and function of the school. It would claim, no doubt, that the school is a great social institution. Does it not provide intellectual training for the future members of society, thus putting at the disposal of the young the experience of the past as a proper equipment for the solution of the problems of the future? To provide this training is to have performed its function. But to do more than this, save indirectly, is not the province or the right of the school. Society has other complementary institutions to which social training may be and must be left. The family, the church, business and political institutions, society itself so far as it environs the individual, are adequate to the task of providing social education. It would be easy to show that, historically, these same institutions once were relied upon to furnish adequate intellectual training, and the history of education is but a recounting of the steps by which society came to transfer to the schools more and more consciously the task of the intellectual education of the young. It would be a wise man who could predict with certainty that society intends to stop here. But were it to do so, we should still be right in calling the school a great social institution. Indeed, this would seem to be what is usually meant in current educational literature, when emphasis is laid on the social character of the school. But there is another sense in which the school is a social institution, in that it is itself a society; a society organized, to be sure, for definite intellectual ends, but none the less forming a large part of the social environment of the pupil, and thereby providing, whether we recognize it or not, a great share of the

social education of the pupil. Of the social character of the school, in this narrower sense, one finds but little recognition in educational theory and practice. Will anyone seriously claim that society has provided, outside of the school, for the proper direction of this education? Can the school, which incidentally, if you please, creates a society, afford to overlook the character that society assumes, save as it affects its purely intellectual mission? On whose head will fall the responsibility for the kind of training this society affords its members? Will the family, can the family or society at large, control this education? It is this function of the school that the *laissez-faire* doctrine overlooks. And yet right here lies the crucial point in the whole problem.

The second method of solving the problem we have called the method of indirect substitution. The main features in this proposed solution embody a distinct recognition of the social appeal made by the fraternity, but would seek to gratify the social impulse through other organizations. The chief harm in the fraternity, it is claimed, is due to the exclusively social aims, and consequent trifling character, of its results. Organizations of a different character with predominately educational aims would incidentally provide adequate social satisfaction, and give permanent and valuable results. The debating club, musical organizations, arts and crafts societies, camera clubs, etc., should be organized, thus giving opportunity for every individual taste, while training the student to apply legitimate interests as the standard for his social selections. The claim is made that through these agencies the student body will come to recognize the inadequacy of the fraternity for the very purpose it is supposed to serve. This method seems open to two objections, a theoretical and a practical one. The practical objection is that experience seems to show that it does not do what it claims to be able to accomplish. Instead of displacing the fraternity, these clubs but provide new fields for the operation of the political genius of the fraternity leaders. To secure the officers of such clubs, to manage them so as to increase the honor-list of fraternity members, becomes at once the aim of the fraternities. Indeed, the claim is openly made that such organizations could not be conducted save by the energetic efforts of the students who by their very qualities are inevitable fraternity timber. The second objection is more theoretical, but just

as much justified by experience. The social instinct cannot be satisfied incidentally. There is such a thing as social recreation, legitimate and inevitable. To attempt to secure this incidentally to the accomplishment of some other end, however good in itself, is to miss the mark. The free and unhampered enjoyment of the society of one's friends is not only a good in itself, but affords a necessary relaxation from the more serious activities of student life, whether formally or informally organized. It is because the fraternity does afford this purely social enjoyment, with its opportunity for close friendship, that it has its strong hold on the young as well as the mature student. However valuable and necessary other clubs may be, they do not and cannot afford this purely social satisfaction. If a substitute is to be found, it must be of a kind to meet this demand directly and avowedly.

The third method of dealing with the fraternity is that of direct prohibition. All things considered, the writer believes that this is the right solution. The remainder of the discussion is, therefore, devoted to a consideration of the reasons for this belief, and to the suggestion of ways and means for the elimination of the fraternity from the school life.

It is a simple axiom, holding good in educational discussions as well as in practical life, that one should not support a good cause by the use of bad arguments. It would be difficult to find a subject where this axiom ought more strictly to be observed than that of the fraternity question. There is hardly any topic on which there is so much need of clear thinking, of discrimination between the essential and the incidental. One ought not to be too exacting, perhaps, where apparent and unquestioned evils are to be combated. If occasionally a high-school principal finds associated with the fraternities his greatest obstacles in the way of good government and good morals, he may be pardoned for confounding the fraternity system with its local manifestations. But surely a dispassionate view of the subject ought to enable us to recognize real distinctions and to discover what the real issue is. The parent and the pupil, as well as the teacher, have a right to this clear recognition of the ground of opposition to the fraternity.

First of all, then, let us admit in all fairness that many of the charges brought against the fraternity are aside of the mark, if actually not petty. It is charged, for example, that the fraternities encourage

immorality. Under this blanket charge are included smoking, drinking, card-playing, truancy, etc.—including, in short, all the faults and vices found among young people. No doubt these particular evils are found among fraternity members. No doubt, too, that individual fraternities, as constituted at a particular time, do promote these evils. But it is equally true that other fraternities are strong influences against the same practices, and that non-fraternity pupils readily find associates in the practices. The writer very much doubts, from his own experience, whether it can be held, after a fair comparative study of the matter, that fraternity members are any more guilty of these practices than others. It is to be remembered that the fraternity is, by reason of its organization, particularly susceptible of observation. Other groups in the school do not stand out, and are actually not studied with the same care. Conclusions on this score are consequently hastily drawn and without comparative value. The same may be said also of the ranking of the fraternity students in their studies. An investigation published in the *School Review* some time ago showed that the charge that the influence of fraternities on the scholastic standing of their members was detrimental is, in one institution at least, entirely without foundation. If these charges are unfounded, it is certainly harmful to base opposition upon them. It is to be remembered that no fraternity is organized to promote vice. Many fraternities have, in this respect, a wholesome influence on their members. It is an outrage on the feelings of such fraternities to charge them unjustly and indiscriminately with evils that they are resolutely combating. I should unhesitatingly declare that such a course is not only not beneficial, but positively harmful to the individual pupils as well as to the school. It ought to be a fundamental article of school government that restrictions and prohibitions should be based on grounds that will not lead to moral confusion on the part of the pupil. The average high-school student, in the long run, can appreciate and will approve genuine moral distinctions. A high-school student, when discussing this charge against the fraternity, pointed out that it was the duty of the school to punish these immoral practices by proceeding against the offenders, whether individual or corporate, instead of confounding the innocent with the guilty; and, in my opinion, he was right.

Again, it is but fair to recognize that the fraternity meets a real social need. This is not to say that the system is therefore justified, or that it meets the need in the proper way. But it is hard to believe that so many young people would cling so persistently and devotedly to a kind of organization with an aim so purely social, were they not finding in it some fundamental satisfaction. Moreover, the fraternity is a means of satisfying this need that the students have evolved for themselves—a significant fact to be remembered in any treatment of the question. We may well ask ourselves what positive attempts have been made by the schools to provide for all, or even a part, of the students what the students have provided for themselves. Were a wise student to put to us this question, would it quite meet the case to tell him that we were not satisfied with his attempt, though we had nothing ourselves to suggest? Shall we not, in our solution of the problem, be compelled to provide him a substitute, not merely that we shall recognize as such, but one that he too will, in time, find even more satisfactory?

Let us, then, try to put before us the real grounds for believing that the fraternity should not be permitted in the secondary school. This we shall not be able to do without touching briefly upon the nature and function of the school. In so doing we may seem to be elaborating the obvious, but the method will have the advantage of bringing out clearly at the start the background of opinion that contributes whatever significance may attach to what is maintained in our definite propositions.

The school is an artificial society; it is not, therefore, without historical justification, nor is it likely to be superseded. It is artificial in the sense that it is an institution which has not, like other social institutions been evolved by its members for the sake of accomplishing some end to which fundamental and natural impulses have pointed. The school has been established by adults for the attainment of ends selected by adults, which ends are supposed to secure the ultimate good of the members of the school. While the purpose and scope of the school have varied through the ages, it is safe to say that, while religious, moral, and intellectual aims have received adequate consideration, the social training of the pupils has received but little attention. It has been the assumption that society outside of the school has made sufficient provision for this training. To some extent this is true, but

neither society nor the school itself has sufficiently recognized the fact that the school-society is a peculiar thing. The result is that the social relations into which the pupil passes on entering school have not been looked upon as a subject for special study and regulation, but have been left to the students themselves. The fraternity has arisen as an attempt on the part of the students to regulate these social relations. Of course where questions of order or morality have come up, the school has long exercised control. But the school has not reached the point of announcing the theory that it has the duty of controlling the social life of the pupils, in so far as that social life is created by the school itself. Without attempting to dwell on this doctrine, which might well be elaborated and defended, it may suffice to call attention to the fact that this theory furnishes the criterion for the duty and authority of the school in the fraternity matter. It is the duty of the school to prescribe the kind of social life that may have its origin and place in the school-society. It is within the authority of the school to regulate and control the social life of its students, where that social life plainly and unmistakably is associated with the school. If this conception of the duty and authority of the school is sound, as the writer believes it is, the following objections to the fraternity in the school may not seem fanciful and remote.

First, the fraternity is harmful to the individual student because it forms a fixed, instead of a fluctuating group. This objection is the adequate answer to the defense of the fraternity made on the score that social grouping is a natural thing. It is natural for the young to associate with one another, and such association is extremely beneficial. All that is usually adduced under this head may be accepted without impairing the force of the objection just mentioned. A boy comes to the high school with his intellectual and moral standards unfixed. Even when he has received the best of training at home, his standards are, after all, those of his parents rather than his own. He is going within four years, either to reject, reaffirm, or reconstruct what has been handed over to him rather than elaborated by him. It is his experience with his fellows that will enable him to do this. Above all things, he should be in a position, during these trying and confusing years, to make selection and choice as wisdom increases. The fraternity offers him companionship and a sort of distinction. It asks him,

in turn, to bind himself for four years to associates who themselves will change, maybe for the worse. It tightens the bond by an appeal to his sense of honor, his pride of opinion, his loyalty, his fear of ostracism, and the dread of being put in a false light; in short, all the finer instincts of a boy are made the guarantee that if he makes a wrong choice, he will not be able to right it by withdrawing from the fraternity. The few instances that might be cited to the contrary only serve to prove the rule. This objection, too, is the vital element in the numerous arguments for and against the fraternity, so far as they concern the interests of the individual member. If it be true that a boy can learn to discriminate between proper and improper associates, that his own narrow and one-sided views and opinions can be altered for the better, that he can gain self-knowledge, only as he lives in vital relations with his fellows, it is doubly true that the advantage of such insight can be conserved only on the condition that he be able to act out what he has learned. Both aspects of this demand for social opportunity must be insisted on, if any sort of moral training is to result. The high-school pupil should be permitted freely to form associations with his fellows, but he must remain free to change them. It is a sheer assumption that the fixed organization affords any greater opportunity for social education than the shifting group. It is undeniable, on the other hand, that the iron law of once a member always a member dulls the sense of discrimination, substitutes group loyalty for individual freedom of choice, and makes the criterion for judging one's fellows their position within or without an artificial group, instead of their inherent worth. It is the duty of the school, therefore, to insure for its wards the unrestricted opportunity to make and remake choice of companions, at least within the range of this authority—that is, within the school itself.

The second objection to the fraternity is that it dominates the social organization of the school. It would be unfair to claim that this is the avowed purpose of the fraternity. It is, nevertheless, a simple matter of fact, to which any impartial observer can give testimony. The writer has recently had the opportunity to listen to a debate on the question of fraternities in high schools—a debate continued through many sessions and participated in by pupils, parents, and teachers. In the course of this debate, all the stock arguments for and against the system in its bearing on the school were rehearsed and reiterated. It was argued in

behalf of the fraternities that their members not only were the leaders in all recognized school activities, but that the system developed such leaders. The implication was that the school for this very reason needed the fraternities. While the purely political character of much of this influence might have been adduced as a counter-argument, the discussion was confined to the merits of the system without undue emphasis on its faulty workings. Again and again, in the course of the argument, the question was asked: If the fraternity is such a good institution for the school because of its influence on fraternity members, what definite provision is there in the fraternity system for the social development of the non-fraternity members? Although the question was formulated in many ways, for the sake of securing a clear comprehension of its meaning, it was never answered. There is no answer. We may well excuse the immature pupil for not recognizing his duty toward less fortunate members of the school. We may even suggest that we should hardly blame him for elaborating a social system that meets his wants, even if others are overlooked. But we cannot therefore, close our own eyes to the facts. And what shall we say as to the school authorities whose duty it is to take a large view of the whole? Shall they, too, adopt the view that it is inevitable that some be left out, and that those who are left out are the unfit? Shall they have recourse to the analogy of mature society, where the same process of selection takes place? It all depends on the view we take of the function of the school. Why, pray, should we boast that the new education has discovered the child, and point to our enlightened psychology which demands that the mature results of science and the arts should be adapted to the capacity of the developing mind? Are we to forget, then, that the social nature of the child is also developing? And are there to be no adaptations on this score? Are we to train the child to make intellectual and practical judgments by the use of material selected, because we know that he can manage it, and give no heed to his method of forming social judgments, nor to the material which is offered him for the exercise of those judgments?

The fraternity system is detrimental to the school, therefore, because, while organizing the school society, it confessedly makes no provision for the social good of the whole. It should be eliminated because it does not permit of the social organization of the school. It is

idle to claim that the fraternity is not to blame for this, and that it does not prevent others from seeking such form of social life as they choose. Were it advisable or necessary, the writer could bring abundant evidence that, in practice, as long as the fraternity system is present, the effect is to prevent anything like a broad social life.

The writer has said that direct prohibition is, in his opinion, the only solution of the problem. Is this possible? It is believed by some that the courts will not sustain public-school authorities in such action. There is some evidence for believing that they will. But, whatever the present likelihood, we must believe that our legislatures and our courts which in their acts and decisions concerning child-labor and juvenile courts, have come to recognize the need of a wide difference of treatment as between adults and children, will support the school authorities in enforcing wise regulations affecting the good of so many thousands of our future citizens. The large private and endowed institutions are free to make such prohibition. The movement for the organization of parents' associations in connection with the schools can be counted upon to be of great service in reaching a proper solution of the question. In one instance the parents' association made it possible for the school to take action without unnecessary friction.

But mere prohibition will not suffice. The schools must have something positive to offer. As has been said before, the fraternity is the solution of the social problem in the school as developed by a portion of the school itself. It is unsatisfactory, as the circumstances of its origin would lead us to expect. The school authorities, working with all the pupils and for all the pupils, must evolve a solution that will be satisfactory to all. That this can be done is the writer's sincere belief.

THE CONY HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY: AN UNCONSCIOUS EXPERIMENT IN TRAINING FOR CITIZENSHIP

ARTHUR HUNTINGTON NASON
New York University

Special preparation for citizenship by methods other than, or auxiliary to, the course in civil government is not a new experiment in secondary schools. In some the class in civics has been organized as a mock legislature; in others the school discipline has been intrusted to a student board. Each of these methods, if successfully carried out, gives, doubtless, some measure of preparation for citizenship. Both, however, fall short in one respect. The mock legislature is so frankly artificial that it can give but slight sense of civic responsibility; and to intrust to the students the maintenance of discipline is, at best, to prepare them for a work in which but few citizens need participate—the actual maintenance of law and order. What is needed primarily to meet the conditions of our day, is training in the efficient and honest administration of the public purse.

This training, to be most effective, must not deal with money that is imaginary, or with money in which the pupils are not vitally concerned. On the contrary, it must involve an actual fund, raised by the student community itself and expended to meet its actual needs. Such conditions may seem, at first thought, difficult to obtain; yet it is under precisely these conditions that the high-school pupils of Augusta, Maine, in an organization entitled the "Cony High School Assembly," are giving themselves, all unconsciously, this financial training for citizenship.

The school in which this organization has grown up is a public high school numbering about two hundred pupils, situated in a town of about twelve thousand inhabitants. Here, thirteen years ago, when interscholastic athletics were first coming into favor the students were confronted with two problems. The first was: How should they pay for the equipment of a school gymnasium and meet the expenses of their athletic teams? Gate receipts were utterly inadequate; and

to solicit funds upon the business street was admittedly a public nuisance. Their solution was a fair, accompanied by amateur theatricals or other entertainment. At first they cleared annually from one hundred to one hundred and fifty dollars. Later, under improved management, they increased this amount to five and even six hundred dollars. Thus, without resorting to public subscription, the students solved the problem of ways and means.

But their second problem was equally important: By what method should their money be apportioned? Their solution was certainly characteristic of this school as it was in the early nineties. Its debating society was then a hotbed of budding parliamentarians; its leading secret fraternity was devoting its evenings to mock legislative sessions; and, finally, one of its most influential students was serving his first term as page in the state senate. These circumstances made it but natural that the power to appropriate money from the common fund should be vested in a highly organized parliamentary body.

The precise form of this body, however, was determined by gradual evolution. As organized September 20, 1892, the Cony High School Assembly was like a New England town-meeting. It consisted of all the students in the school; was officered by a moderator and clerk and met, upon written call of any five members, to act upon the business named in the warrant. This simple organization, however, soon proved inadequate. Appropriations could be rushed through without due consideration, and, when once granted, might be misapplied with impunity. The assembly had no control over other school organizations; and some of them, notably the editorial board of the school magazine, did not scruple to incur a debt and then to expect the assembly to meet the deficit. Possession of the common purse, however, soon gave to the assembly its rightful ascendancy. Little by little it adopted legislation perfecting its own procedure and bringing the other organizations under its control; and at the close of the second year of its existence the assembly embodied these provisions in a new constitution.

Under this constitution, which has changed but little since its adoption eleven years ago, the assembly has become an organization much more like a state senate or house of representatives than like its original model, the town-meeting. An appropriation, for example,

must now be proposed in the form of an act; must be accompanied by a detailed statement of facts; must receive two several readings before its passage to be enacted; and must be posted on the school bulletin-board for at least twenty-three hours between the two readings. This last rule may be suspended, but only by unanimous consent.

As a further safeguard, the assembly forbids its treasurer to make payment except on a warrant signed by the moderator. This warrant specifies the date on which the appropriation was passed, the amount appropriated, and the person to whom it is payable. For the signature of the latter, moreover, the printed form provides also a blank receipt. Thus for each appropriation the treasurer at the end of her term of office (for the treasurer is now invariably a girl) submits to the Auditing committee both a warrant and a receipt. As the amount handled by the treasurer in a single year has, in one instance, exceeded \$1,300, the real importance of these safeguards is evident to every student.

But the assembly's watchfulness does not end when its appropriations leave the treasury. All officers that handle assembly funds—not alone its own officers, as the superintendent of the gymnasium and the chairman of the library committee, but also the officers of other organizations, as the managers of the several athletic teams—all are required to submit detailed reports, which are audited with the same care that is bestowed upon the treasurer's accounts.

In view of the elaborate nature of the organization just described it is perhaps an occasion for surprise that the assembly has survived and flourished through these thirteen years. A part of its success, doubtless, has resulted from the unobtrusive co-operation of the teachers, especially of the present principal, Mr. C. F. Cook. But the chief credit belongs to the students themselves. For several years it was the custom of the retiring officers to meet, during the summer vacation to drill the aspirants of the coming year for the duties that might devolve upon them. Later a secret fraternity was formed, with procedure similar to that of the assembly; and this not only gave excellent training in parliamentary practice, but, on several occasions, rendered service as a "good government club" in the cause of "civic righteousness." The custom, moreover, by which the clerk of one year usually becomes the moderator of the next has undoubtedly tended to preserve

the continuity of method while increasing the standard of efficiency.

To give a more definite idea of the usual method of procedure and the nature of the business done, a brief quotation from the Journal may be permitted. The following extract shows the transactions of the seventh, eighth, and ninth meetings of the assembly of 1899-1900. It is interesting not only because it illustrates, within a brief space, a considerable variety of procedure—the passage of a bill in regular course, of a bill under suspension of the rules, of an order, and of a resolution, and the election of an officer by ballot—but more especially because the particular votes here recorded are themselves significant.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1900

Assembly called to order by clerk and call read.

[Moderator took the chair.]

Journal of the last meeting approved without reading.

Mr. Sanborn, bill:

An act to appropriate five (5) dollars for expenses of delegates to Brunswick.

Bill received first reading, and February 21, 1900, 1 P. M., was set for second reading.

Moderator then called for nominations for the delegate to go to Brunswick with manager of baseball team.

Stone, 1900, and Russell, 1900, were nominated. Vote by ballot: total number of votes cast, 129; necessary for a choice, 65; Russell, 106; Stone, 23.

Moderator then announced Mr. Russell elected delegate.

Mr. Gannett, bill:

An act appropriating one hundred and fifty (\$150) dollars for the benefit of the Cony High School Library.

Bill received first reading, and February 21, 1900, 1 P. M., was set as the time for the second reading.

Mr. Gannett, order:

Ordered, That the moderator appoint a committee of five, to be known as the Library Committee.

Moderator then appointed the following: Mr. Cook, Mr. Gannett, Miss Reynolds, Miss Carver, Miss Downing.

On motion, adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1900

Assembly called to order by clerk, and call read.

[Moderator took the chair.]

Journal of the last meeting approved without reading.

An act to appropriate five (5) dollars for expense of delegates to Brunswick came up by assignment; which was read the second time and passed to be enacted.

An act to appropriate one hundred and fifty (150) dollars for benefit of Cony High School Library came up by assignment; which was read the second time and passed to be enacted.

Miss Little, resolution:

Resolved, That a vote of thanks be extended to Mr. W. D. Stinson for the fine picture of Maine's late statesman, James G. Blaine, which he has so kindly presented to the school.

Read and passed.

On motion, adjourned.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1900

Assembly called to order by clerk, and call read.

[Moderator took the chair.]

Journal of the last meeting approved without reading.

Mr. Gannett, bill:

An act to appropriate one hundred and fifty (150) dollars for a piano fund.

The bill received its two separate readings [under suspension of the rules] and passed to be enacted.

On motion, adjourned.¹

In determining the value of the Cony High School Assembly as unconscious training for citizenship, we should consider, however, not only the method, but also the object of its appropriations. In a school in which athletic interest runs high, in which each athletic manager desires to make the best possible showing, and in which the annual fair by which the money is raised is avowedly given primarily for the support of school athletics, it must be a constant temptation to the students to appropriate practically their entire fund for merely current expenses. Yet in no instance has such a disposition of the funds been made. On the contrary, the assembly has uniformly invested a portion of its income for such purposes as books for the school library, pictures and statuary for the rooms, and apparatus for the gymnasium. Indeed, out of the \$4,263.28 appropriated by the assembly in the thirteen years of its existence, \$1,394.58, or nearly 33 per cent. has gone for these permanent improvements. The distribution of these appropriations by years will appear from the following table:

¹ The foregoing extract is transcribed from the original record by Mr. William M. Badger, 1901, clerk of the assembly of 1899-1900; *Journals*, Vol. IV, pp. 174-77.

SCHOOL YEAR	TOTAL APPROPRIATION	APPROPRIATION FOR PERMANENT IMPROVEMENT	
		Amount	Per Cent
1892-1893	\$187.56	\$31.05	17
1893-1894	72.47	34.50	48
1894-1895	107.00	15.75	15
1895-1896	93.00	30.00	32
1896-1897	209.10	50.00	24
1897-1898	149.79	25.00	17
1898-1899	164.17	50.00	30
1899-1900	490.90	342.50	70
1900-1901	519.48	190.83	37
1901-1902	519.49	193.75	37
1902-1903	583.19	135.40	23
1903-1904	672.30	141.80	22
1904-1905	494.83	153.10	31
Total	\$4,263.28	\$1,394.58	33

In this \$1,394.58 appropriated for permanent improvements, the several items are as follows: library, \$805.00; gymnasium apparatus, \$237.35;¹ toward a new piano, \$150.00; toward new blackboards, \$75.00; pictures and statuary, \$60.00; all other items \$67.23.

The interest which the assembly has manifested in improving the equipment of the school has exerted an influence even outside the student body. The practice of presenting pictures and statuary to the school has spread from the assembly and the classes to the general public; and the purchase of gymnasium apparatus by the assembly has induced the city to provide more spacious quarters for the gymnasium. But most interesting are the two instances in which the assembly following doubtless the example of Mr. Carnegie, has announced to the city government that, if the city would appropriate a specified amount for some needed improvement, the assembly would appropriate an equal sum. In each case the city has accepted the assembly's proposition; and a new piano and new slate blackboards are the results.

To overestimate the value of the Cony High School Assembly as training for citizenship is, of course, easy. We must remember that many boys take no part in its discussions; that many girls attend its meetings only because they are required to attend. But at least this

¹ To this amount must be added an appropriation of \$125 for the gymnasium, made from the proceeds of the first fair before the assembly was in existence.

may be said: Each pupil that graduates from the Cony High School has lived for four years in a community where his labor contributes to the common fund, and where his voice helps to determine how it shall be spent. He has gained at least some knowledge of parliamentary procedure, some notion of financial accountability, some consciousness of the difference between wisdom and extravagance in public appropriations. In the character thus formed is the true preparation for citizenship.

WHAT KIND OF EDUCATION IS BEST SUITED TO BOYS?¹

REUBEN POST HALLECK
Principal, Boys' High School, Louisville, Ky.

I hope to see an end to debates on the question whether one sex is superior to the other. One might as well debate whether the existence of the lungs or of the heart is the more necessary to life. We do, however, feel that our mothers differ from our fathers, not as two individuals of the same sex, but that there are striking intellectual and emotional differences. We feel glad instead of sorry that our mothers differ from our fathers; but if anyone was to dare raise the question of the inferiority of our mothers, the first impulse of American manhood would be to answer that question with a blow, and the more our mothers differ from our fathers, the harder would probably be that blow.

Some have said that there can be no more "male" or "female" education than "male" or "female" literature. Ask any intelligent librarian who selects reading for adolescents, if he does not recognize differences of sex in making up his reading list, and if he might not call books on big-game hunting and adventure "male" literature. Some objectors frankly grant that there is a difference, but they say: "Educate both in precisely the same way, and you will find that they will assimilate only what their different natures and instincts prompt, just as two vegetables growing side by side will absorb only the elements which each needs." Would any agriculturist claim that it would be wise to give different vegetables exactly the same fertilizer? Could he not rightly claim that one might need more potash, the other more ammonia? Suppose ammonia was used on potatoes, and they absorbed no more of it than their nature permitted, would there be as many and as large potatoes as if the necessary potash had been provided? Might not also a certain amount of the ammonia be wasted?

¹ Read before the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association, at Louisville, Ky. February 27, 1906.

If the two sexes differ emotionally, intellectually, and physically, it can hardly be unwise or unscientific for education to recognize whatever differences exist. Boys will never receive the best education, so long as they are taught chiefly by the opposite sex. The majority of the members of the Mosely English Educational Commission, who inspected American schools, said there was occasion to view with alarm the growing preponderance of women teachers. Professor Henry E. Armstrong, F.R.S., says in *THEIR* report:

To put the matter in very simple terms, it seemed to me on the occasion of my former visit — and the impression was confirmed during my recent visit — that the boy in America is not brought up to punch another boy's head, or to stand having his own punched, in a healthy and proper manner; that there is a strange and indefinable feminine air coming over the men; a tendency toward a common—if I may so call it, a sexless — mode of thought.

Some of the members of this commission said there was a marked contradiction in the liberality of Americans in erecting and equipping magnificent school buildings, and their parsimony in refusing to pay good men teachers enough to instruct their children. Some say that it is better to employ first-rate women than third-rate men. The only possible answer to that reply is that it is better to employ first-rate men as well as first-rate women, and to pay a first-rate price for all who train American manhood. Our people are slower in educational reform than in getting improved machinery, but when we once do realize the importance of the highest type of men teachers, the money will be forthcoming. One boy as a result of better teaching may through his inventiveness and superior grasp of a business give employment to thousands of people, and make the money spent for high-grade masculine teachers the best possible investment for the commonwealth. Of course, it goes without saying that we should have just as many women teachers, and of an equally high grade. At present there is not much but the missionary spirit that will impel our best young men to become and remain secondary teachers. There are now many such missionaries among our high-school instructors, but many years' experience leads me to express the opinion that only third-rate men, if influenced by strictly utilitarian inducements, can afford to remain teachers in the overwhelming majority of our high schools.

In the name of the boy, I protest against the tendency to discour-

age honest rivalry in the school. I doubt whether too much rivalry is necessary or desirable for girls. This question, however, is one for women and evolution to answer. With men, life is a contest, and fortunately most boys love a contest. Those who do not must drop to the rear in the struggle for existence. That tremendous struggle which results in the survival of the fittest, and the consequent improvement of plant and animal and thought product, must continue if life is to progress. It is not the true masculine spirit which says: "Never have honors in a school. Never pit two individuals or sides against each other. Never inquire whether John can do better work than William, but only whether John's present record shows any improvement over his past." If a school for boys is to be conducted on this basis, it will be run out of harmony with the laws of life. If a member of your family had to undergo a grave surgical operation, would you employ Dr. Brown because his record for fatalities was decreasing; or would you ask for the services of Dr. Robinson, who had only half as great a death record? I know the manager of a manufacturing plant who in two years lost 12 per cent. on the capital stock. Although his second year was slightly better than his first, the directors said to him when he argued this improvement: "You forget that we are in competition with other factories in this country and abroad. You forget that these losses will force us to close the factory, throw our workmen out of employment, and cause their children to cry for bread. We shall look for a better manager."

The advocate of a less masculine type of education says: "Contests develop an unsocial spirit and cause hard feelings. For this reason, if for no other, we must avoid them." So Governor Folk was wrong in developing unsocial feelings among the St. Louis grafters! So William Travers Jerome must be asked not to twist the tail of the Tammany Tiger! So even our own David fighting the Goliath of trust and railroad discriminations must be ordered to take the stone out of his sling. So contests are unsocial and must be avoided! Shades of our Puritan and Virginian ancestors! Who wants to be social with the devil? So long as evil exists in its myriad forms, we must develop fighters. The trouble with America today is not that there are too many fighters, but that there are too few Folks and Jeromes and Roosevelts. A keen German critic says:

Their amiable good nature is, in a certain sense, the great virtue of the Americans; in another sense, their great failing. It is actually his good nature which permits him everywhere to overlook carelessness and crookedness, and so opposes with latent resistance all efforts at reform.

Modern psychology has taught educators to build on the instincts of the young. A strong instinct of boyhood, as well as a prime requirement of manhood, is this joy in honest rivalry. A boy's nature responds quickly to all contests which determine the best fellow, whether in running, jumping, shooting, speaking, computing, or in any branch of physical or intellectual achievement where a boy cares to excel. One of the most valuable parts of the curriculum in our high school is the reading aloud each morning for fifteen minutes to the assembled school. In order that the tastes of the teachers may not be too strongly superimposed upon the boys, we sometimes allow them to choose what they will hear. They almost unanimously prefer a bull-fight to a love-story, a Kipling poem of blood to a Tennysonian idyll, a wild tale of war and trial to one full of sentiment and analysis. Some people not only think that such a choice proves the total depravity of boys, but even sigh that the boys are not all girls, and then go to work and make them girls as fast as possible. Now I, for my part, think that if the boys had decided differently, there would have been need of a doctor. It is useless to bewail Huxley's dictum that "what has been decided among prehistoric protozoa cannot be annulled by act of Parliament," or to grow impatient because we must start from a boy's present self and from the dominant interests of boyhood to climb to the heights of courageous and altruistic manhood. It is only by appealing to the naturally strong instincts of the boy that he can be truly led to nobler instincts by the only sure teacher of the heart-strings. I shall never forget the morning that one of our instructors, a manly athletic fellow admired by all the school, read aloud Davis' "Bar Sinister." The dog-fights won the hearts of the boys. Their interest was alive, their emotions were mobile, so that, when the moment came for the strong, clean, prize dog either to desert his old mother, dirty and only a cur of the streets, or to save her by a fight to the death, the boys, one and all, were moved to pity, love, tenderness, and even heroic impulse by the brave fight of that dog hero.

A study of heredity and evolution reminds us of the savage methods adopted by nature to achieve her ends. To improve a species, all weak members must go. To make sure that one individual may survive, a million are born and perhaps sacrificed. There is no compromise, no consideration for the unfit, in the biological world. The Spartan abandoned his weak child on the mountain side. For the last nineteen hundred years the individual has been slowly rising, until today his rights are sacred. Sometimes the most fit in our homes are physically the weakest, those who stand most in need of our protection. In the education of boys, therefore, along with masculine aggressiveness and initiative should be developed a spirit of tenderness and a desire to protect the weak. The successful protector must be strong and resolute, and not easily intimidated; hence courage, strength, and the power to fight must be present in the protector. It is today the strongest nations that are kindest. If a stop is to be put to the mutilation and enslavement of those wretched natives of western Africa by Portugal and Belgium, the interference must come from a nation at once strong and aggressive and tender-hearted. The poorest inhabitant of the Ghetto district in New York City, who has suffered injustice, knows that if he goes in the middle of the night to the home of that prince of fighters, William Travers Jerome, he will be kindly received, and that Jerome will say to him: "You will have justice, or the heavens shall fall."

One of the great influences which for thousands of years have helped to develop sympathy and tenderness in the Aryan race is being rapidly lost to this generation. I think that over 60 per cent. of the members of this association who are now over forty and who have achieved the most, have had some training on a farm, and have consequently come into close contact with domestic animals. These poor creatures must be numbered among the greatest teachers that have helped to raise humanity to a fully civilized state. If one of our early Aryan progenitors treated his domestic animals brutally or even carelessly, he could not succeed beside his more compassionate neighbor, who watched them as if they were his children, and who carried the helpless lamb home in his arms. These domestic animals have helped to give woman her peculiar qualities, because it was she who first attached them to her home, trained them, and cared for

their helpless young. In return for this service, the domestic animals have given to woman a patience and a tenderness half divine.

We must not today lose the services of these animals as teachers in any case where they can be retained. The trolley is making suburban and country life easier, and it will give us back some of our lost teachers. It would be a partial education for every boy to own at least one domestic animal, and to care for it entirely, at first under proper supervision. I remember when, as a young boy, I learned one of the greatest lessons of my life. I found one of my own little chickens beaten down by a hard rainstorm and feebly gasping for breath. I took that chick in my hands, ran with him to the house, wrapped him in flannel, and laid him by the hearth fire. In about half an hour, which seemed an age to me, I heard the little fellow say, "Peep, peep." I gave him some warm food, and as the helpless fellow nestled against my hand, I realized that I had saved him, and I felt the absolute luxury of protecting the weak. I doubt if any man who suddenly made a million dollars ever felt the thrill of a keener pleasure than I then knew. Today I thank every domestic animal that taught me in my boyhood days; every chick, kitten, dog, calf, or colt that needed my care and protection, that shared my companionship, and that gave me glimpses of that ineffable beatitude which has come to me only when I have protected the weak and helped to raise the fallen.

To guard against a purely pedagogical treatment of the education of boys, I recently wrote a large number of letters to business men in various parts of the United States, asking what education should be given to the rank and file of boys, preparatory to successful business of any kind. The replies laid the most emphasis on the ability to write, speak, and spell the English language correctly. One large corporation said:

We notice that slovenly penmen are usually lacking in system, accuracy, and careful methods generally. . . . Public speaking and debating ought to be a prominent part of the course in every high school for boys.

Arithmetic was next stressed. A Louisville corporation informed me that a graduate of my school was refused an excellent place because he did not make well-formed, legible figures. Geography, manual training, and history were declared important subjects. Some manu-

facturers said that every boy who expected to be promoted should also know something of physics and chemistry. Another insisted on adding geometry, which he said should come before algebra. The majority emphasized the importance of the high-school course. "It enables boys to grasp more quickly the problems which confront them." The following expression of opinion would represent not unfairly the attitude of the leading men of affairs throughout the United States.

The more education a boy gets, the more apt is he to discover short-cuts and avenues of saving to which an ordinary mind simply will not address itself.

The most interesting feature of these replies was the emphatic expression of opinion by certain great business corporations that culture studies are of vast importance for boys. This changing opinion deserves attention at the beginning of the twentieth century. I wrote the Baldwin Locomotive Works, a corporation which has about 20,000 employees, to learn its position in regard to culture studies, and I received the following reply, under date of January 17, 1906:

Our ideas in general are that, no matter what may be his subsequent career, it is important for a boy to qualify himself with the broadest and most thorough education possible within the time at his command. The more thorough his mental discipline, the more complete his knowledge of mathematics, the classics, natural philosophy, and other general branches, the better is the foundation on which to build the special knowledge requisite for the specific field which he may decide to enter. It is in accordance with this view that we do not recommend manual training as an education for a boy intending to choose mechanical pursuits for his life-work. We feel that the time which manual training takes from study of the broad foundation branches above mentioned cannot, except at greater labor and cost, be regained later in life. When he enters the mechanical pursuit, his whole mind is concentrated upon it, and he can then achieve, in a few weeks or a few months, progress which is more practical and more valuable than the smattering of mechanical knowledge obtained in a training school.

Following the same principle, we should perhaps take a directly contrary view were the boy to adopt a career outside of mechanics, because then the mechanical training would tend to broaden his faculties and increase his powers of observation, constituting a form of education not likely to be obtained during his later career.

For one of the greatest of the so-called soulless corporations of the world to insist on the value of culture studies for ordinary apprentices marks, let us hope, the beginning of a new epoch. Let

us remember that we shall have to search longer than Diogenes to find a middle-aged man who will bless the parent, teacher, or school official who, by argument or otherwise, deprived him of the chance of taking culture studies and of receiving enjoyment therefrom. Certainly those who have experienced the quality of enjoyment that can come only from culture would be the last to exchange it for a few more dollars and cents. If by a study of astronomy, the boy can get more pleasure from looking at the heavens, then let him study astronomy. Even the average workman does not limit his purchases to what is strictly practical. He demands wall-paper and pictures for his home.

All that we can give boys advantageously is such general training in the foundation subjects, such power of initiative, such general culture and moral development, that they can face and solve the most varied problems. A boy almost always finds that his arithmetic never quite fits the special business that he enters. Wholesale dealers wrote letters to me complaining that boys do not at first quickly know "the equivalent in units of $\frac{3}{144}$ of a gross, $\frac{5}{12}$ of a dozen, $\frac{3}{20}$ of a thousand," and that they are puzzled "in figuring discounts based on percentages." Business men have no right to expect that boys will come to them adepts in such special lines of figuring, but they may justly demand that the boys shall have had sufficient mental training to learn how to do quickly what is required. A young tanner, who took chemistry in college, told me that he wished he had studied a different kind of chemistry for his business. Most of us have made the discovery that college did not fit us exactly for anything. I think school and college did a large part of their duty if they enabled us to fit ourselves. We are at last slowly learning the truth that special mastery in any business must come largely through one's own moral and intellectual power to acquire the needed knowledge in connection with experience. Josh Billings was correct in saying: "Success don't consist in never makin' blunders, but in never makin' the same one twict."

We could so train a boy that he would be as accurate as an almanac along given lines; but he would soon be a last year's almanac. Our national census shows that large numbers are forced to change their occupation. Business men say that you cannot run a business

today as it was conducted five years ago. I think that men of affairs will gradually agree with the opinion that education should not early in life cut too deep and unalterable a channel for the stream of thought and action, but should enrich and increase the volume of the stream, leaving the exigency of business life to direct the course.

Foreigners say that Americans of the generation now passing, those brought up on the farm, have led the world in three respects—in the power of initiative, in the habit of relying on themselves, and in will-power. I believe that a decline in the initiative and self-reliance of our boys has already set in, and that it is the duty of every superintendent and principal to ask: "How can my school be so conducted as to increase the spirit of initiative and self-reliance?" I believe that every one of our schools can be improved in this respect.

My experience with the boys of my own school leads me to believe that under present conditions the open-air playground is one of the very best agents to develop initiative, self-reliance, and the social side which makes these qualities valuable. My boys through their own exertions secured an entire square of land four blocks from their school in the heart of the city. They fenced this in, laid out a running-track, tennis courts, baseball diamond, and football gridiron, and also built a clubhouse. Almost everything connected with this park seems to develop self-reliance and social qualities as well as initiative. Since the decline of agriculture and of Elizabethan variety in England, the English have relied largely on their playgrounds to keep the peculiarly Anglo-Saxon qualities from atrophying. Wellington said that he won Waterloo on the playground at Eton. A member of the Mosely Commission expresses surprise that the Americans "are not yet alive to the excellent opportunities for work which the playing-fields afford," and he adds that no amount of physical training under cover can "ever be a satisfactory substitute for free, spontaneous play."

I have heard educators wrangle by the hour over the question whether knowledge of one subject confers any power to deal with subjects outside of its immediate domain. There is one kind of training, however, which fits every business of life equally well. Moral power can be used to attack any of the duties of life, no matter how dissimilar. The United States senator, the life-insurance president,

and the plumber alike need moral training, but this is precisely the training which lags farthest behind. Intellectual culture has substituted more refined and intricate ways of wrong-doing for the clumsy, repellent methods of a thousand years ago. Robbers once held the feet of their victim to the fire to make him give up his property. Now we have the intellectual adroitness necessary to plan stock reorganizations, to juggle expense accounts, and to bribe commonwealths. Great corporations have said in reply to my questions that they are now more than ever before demanding that everyone who is placed in line for promotion shall have character and moral backbone. If they temporarily waive this requirement, they say that experience has taught them that they are providing future trouble for themselves. They want officials who will not gamble, even if they happen to be at Monte Carlo, four thousand miles away from home, or who will not allow an adventuress to break up their homes.

Boys will show the most rapid moral improvement only under the inspiring influence of the best teachers, who keep them marching forward to the music of noble ideals, until that way of marching has become a habit, and a change would cause not only inconvenience, but positive suffering. To his dying day George Washington said: "The mystery of my life is how Benedict Arnold, American-born and bred, could have become a traitor." Let us educators stress the moral side of our work, until we can say: "Our boys may go wrong, but we have trained them so that the first start in that direction will be as unnatural as the love of death."

ADJUSTMENT OF SECONDARY WORK TO THE INDIVIDUAL

FLORENCE MILNER

Detroit University School, Detroit, Mich.

Someone has remarked, perhaps facetiously, that the great educational ambition of the French is to produce so perfect a system that every child in France shall be answering the same question in the same manner at the same moment. For a long time the tendency in American administration of schools was in a similar direction. In zeal for developing a perfect *system*, the true meaning of the word was perverted. A system should represent a connected view of all the truths or principles of the department of knowledge or action under consideration. Frequently it has meant uniformity, not unity; identity rather than symmetry; a narrowed view, not a connected view. In the attempt to evolve a great system, the individual was lost sight of, and boys and girls were treated as though they existed for the schools, not the schools for them.

There was once a teacher whose school was inanely orderly, whose pupils recited according to a set method, standing in a prescribed position, and, when not engaged in some restrictive exercise, sat, as the superintendent expressed it, "like so many darning-needles stuck in a board." There were only girls in the room, and they were arranged upon a definite plan. In the middle row they occupied the exact middle of the seat. Those in the rows at the right sat at the extreme right in their seats; those at the left, at the extreme left. In those days it was the fashion to wear the hair parted, and it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the partings on those little heads made straight lines down those seven prim rows. That school was like a set of jointed dolls, and the work as wooden and mechanical as the appearance of the pupils.

To be sure, this was an extreme case, but the same spirit prevailed elsewhere, and in the desire to have an orderly school, to have things done uniformly, and to produce quiet, even though it were the quiet

of stagnation, the individual was lost sight of in crowding him into the particular niche which the system said he must fill.

Then the pendulum swung the other way. The kindergarten is doubtless more than anything else responsible for the change. It taught the rights of the individual and the desirability of allowing each child to grow and develop according to his own peculiar characteristics in a natural, unconscious way. The attempt by the untrained to put this idea into practice has resulted in the absolute perversion of the entire theory. Development came to mean unrestrained and undirected action; the will of the child was allowed to lead; he must be entertained and amused, and his desires must never be thwarted.

The principal of one of the Detroit schools, in passing the kindergarten room, heard the screaming of a child. She went in to investigate, and found that a little boy had asked for something, and the teacher, in responding to his request, had not done exactly as he wished. He had worked out a philosophy of life for himself, and had learned that, when he wanted a particular thing, the best way to get it was to lie down on the floor and kick and scream until it was surrendered to him. In the present case he was simply applying the remedy. The principal asked him to go to her room; but words were of no avail, so she gathered him up by such parts of his clothing as came readily to hand and carried him to the office. Her method of dealing with him has not been made public, but they came to an understanding, and in the friendly talk that followed, the child remarked: "We have awful times at home. They don't know what to do with me when I want things." A few days later the mother of the child went to visit the school. On the way the little boy said to her: "If the principal asks you to go to the office, mother, you better go right along and not make any fuss about it."

This, too, is an extreme case. Between these two extremes lies the happy medium, and the thinking educational world is out upon a hunt for it.

The purely intellectual side presents several problems. Those who are preparing for college practically establish the intellectual standards of a school, and the schools, in turn, adopt the compulsory demands of the colleges. All who have had anything to do with

administrative work know that each college sets the pace according to its own particular conditions. In trying to meet these requirements, and at the same time offer the best possible advantages to those who are not going to college, schools have tried all sorts of experiments. They have had a uniform course of study; they have had various courses, some with much of foreign language, some with little, and some with none at all. Then they have tried to work without a defined course, with unlimited electives which allow a student to take almost anything with a hop, skip, and jump from arithmetic to physics, Latin, chemistry, etc., as impulse directs; and the last state of those schools has been worse than the first. This has been called allowing the individual to develop naturally, forgetting that the order of nature is "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."

The leaders in matters educational have for some time been seeking agreement upon college-entrance requirements. At first glance this may seem like a return to the method of cutting out all candidates upon the same pattern, but it is really a definite and rational move in the opposite direction. A carefully considered scheme of unit requirements will demand uniform training along certain lines, allowing at the same time scope for individual choice in others. It should make less demand for information, more for training. It will make it possible to train students in the spirit of the classics, to a feeling for the magnificent sweep of the lines of the great poets, without their being able, perhaps, to discuss the exact difference between the *cæsura* of Homer and of Vergil.

We often hear the expression: "School is a preparation for life." School is a part of life, a real and important part, and we have no more right to assume that a young person begins to live only when he leaves school than that the life of a plant begins when it bursts into bloom. A high-school girl once said: "I used to feel that I wanted to get through school each day just as soon as I could, so as to do things outside. Somehow school seemed to be a duty that had to be got out of the way before I could begin to live my own life. But now I just live as much here as at home." This feeling should be universal.

If this be the right position, then the responsibility of the school

is not over when it settles the intellectual question. The physical, social, and moral development of the young person should form a part of the scheme. To render this possible, schools must be more than lesson-mills. The one-session plan does not offer the widest field of usefulness, for under it a school can be little more than a place to come to recite. Study, recitation, manual training, and genuine hard play, even for secondary schools, should each have a place in the daily program. This is impossible when a school assembles at 8:30 and closes at 1. Of course the recitations can be heard and some study accomplished within that time, but the day cannot be a fully rounded one, or such as the young people have a right to claim.

Athletics should come as a rest from study, hence its place in school alternating with study and recitation. To get the best results, athletic work demands numbers; otherwise it fails from pure inanition. As proof one has only to call to mind his own futile attempts to take systematic exercise alone. When it becomes a part of regular school work under intelligent supervision, numbers and wholesome rivalry render it both interesting and healthful.

The same arguments to a certain extent hold in manual training. We are gregarious by nature, and we do with greater zeal and without conscious exertion the thing that someone else is doing at the same time. This is not a place to exploit manual training; its desirability has been passed upon by competent judges, and schools throughout the country are putting it in as rapidly as equipment can be furnished. To be able to work with one's hands is no longer considered a curse, but an accomplishment, and neither boy nor girl has attained full individual development until he knows the joy that dwells in skilful fingers.

Although to this all-around development the financial side presents difficulties, still tradition is largely in evidence. Because schools have been reasonably successful under a certain plan, that plan is considered adequate. Large classes, with the full time of teachers occupied in recitations, has too often been the standard. Economy in school administration has meant reducing the force until the largest possible number in the fewest possible classes can be heard by the fewest possible teachers. The determining factor has often

been the number of seats that can be crowded into a room, or the number of pupils who can be induced to get along without any regular seat. This may result in the saving of a few dollars of public money, and gain for someone a reputation for great executive ability, but it is not conducive to the highest development of the individual.

Each recitation teacher should have certain periods free for consultation with pupils, and for such individual work as may seem desirable. All possible pressure should be brought to bear to reduce classes. Of course, a teacher can manage thirty-five or forty in a class, allowing them to get what they can out of a general presentation of the subject; but until the class is small enough so that each mind can be felt each day, the work is not right. When this is possible, and only then, can the teacher reach individual needs.

Besides this, there should be someone whose sole business it is to have a personal acquaintance with individual students. The plan of most high schools is that of an assembly-room in charge of a strong teacher, who is expected not only to maintain order in the room, but to keep the records, doing all clerical work for a hundred, two hundred, or more students, to examine every case of absence, to hold the school to habits of punctuality, and, besides all this, to hear classes most of the time. What can be expected in attention to individuals as long as this state exists?

Every school should have one or more assembly-rooms, according to the size of the school, in which no recitations shall be heard. Over that room shall be placed the biggest man or woman within the power of the school to obtain. Such a teacher, in order to keep in close sympathy with the vital workings of the school, should have one or two classes each day—never more than two—and should be allowed to take these to a recitation-room, putting the next best teacher in the study-room for the time. Just keeping order is the simplest of all things that a good session-room teacher does, and when a school is rightly in hand, that phase of it can be safely delegated for a short time. But the arrangement should always be considered temporary, and the hand of the permanent teacher should never be lifted. Under these conditions it is possible for the teacher to have some real knowledge of the young people in charge. He can learn something of their ambitions, something of the trend of each mind, can test its moral fiber, find the failing and apply the remedy. In the study-

room he will discover the weak spots in the teaching force, and be in a position to advise teachers to the correction of those faults, or to speak with authority as to their final usefulness to the school.

There should be a system of reports from each teacher on the character of work done by each pupil. That does not mean that a formal standing should be given, but at least once a week a report of all those whose work has been unsatisfactory should be in the hands of the study-room teacher. His business is to look into the cause of the failure and readjust program or student as may be necessary.

Again, wide opportunity for usefulness is offered in watching habits of study and in correcting bad ones. He will soon find that he is expected to answer questions in Latin, Greek, mathematics, physics, history, and all other branches of the curriculum. He may not be an authority on all these, but his knowledge of methods of study should enable him to put the student on the right track for solving the difficulty for himself. Hours of hard labor and possible utter discouragement can often be saved by a wise answering of an intelligent question at the time. Do not understand that it is the business of this teacher to answer every question or to do the work for the student; that is comparatively an easy task; but he should give such judicious guiding or intelligent questioning as shall put the pupil in the way of doing the thing himself. A school should learn to look upon such a teacher as "a very present help in trouble;" as a friend, not a task-master; as one whose highest mission is to serve, not to command. "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be the servant of you all; and whosoever will be the chief among you, let him be your minister."

This study-room teacher should also determine whether the school is working good or ill to the individual student. It sometimes becomes his duty to decide whether the best development of boy or girl requires him to remain in school or to leave it. Many a loafer has been made by keeping a boy at his books when his heart was elsewhere. If he is determined to go to work, if he is naturally industrious, and scholarly pursuits do not appeal to him, if the school cannot reach him, then the highest duty to this young person is to take side with him even against the cherished wish of parents.

The same attitude should be taken toward college. A degree is not all-important, and often trying for it will result only in mediocre

work and in the possible shutting one out from some other field of real usefulness.

These and a thousand other problems, varying according to the number under his care, will occupy the mind and heart of every faithful teacher.

In the public schools, large numbers, insufficient teaching force, the demands of living up to a system, the tangle of red-tape, and countless other external conditions present difficulties and demand the expenditure of much energy in overcoming resistance; yet even there much has been accomplished in attention to the individual. School laws may be inadequate, school boards degenerate into political machines, superintendents be but the tool of designing men, principals be but figure heads; yet between all this and the interests of the young people stands a solid phalanx, the rank and file of faithful teachers. Let conditions be as unfavorable as they may, let salaries be inadequate, let tenure of position be utterly uncertain, yet the majority of teachers work on in unflinching devotion to a problem which they understand in their hearts, but may not be able to formulate.

After all has been said, the final solution of the question rests with the individual teacher. You may plan courses of study; you may demand college degrees, or insist upon special work in pedagogy; you may set up all kinds of artificial standards; yet in the end everything depends upon the personality of the teacher. What that is lies beyond the power of any pen to define. From experience all appreciate what it means; all recognize its force when coming in contact with it. The man or woman possessed of the right kind of personality must have more than intellectual attainments, more than an interest in teaching history or some other subject; must be intensely human; must keep ever the spirit of youth, though locks be gray; must have quick sympathy both with joy and sorrow; and, above all, must believe in young people. That does not imply a blind, maudling, sentimental faith—nothing could be worse than that—but a faith that sees both good and bad, tells the truth about it, and is able, while being as severe as need be, to show back of all a genuine human love. That teacher must be master of himself, of the situation, of the individual; must be patient, alert, quick of judgment, interested, honest, happy, and untiring in service. The demands are heavy, but the reward is great.

POMPEIAN WALL-SCRIBBLINGS¹

LOUISE M. BREITENBACH

Liggett School, Detroit, Mich.

Time, that mordant destroyer, with a peculiar irony which calls forth our deepest gratitude, has preserved for us one of the most transitory and evanescent remains of ancient life. By the wall inscriptions² of Pompeii, mute memorials of generations lying "in the dark backward and abysm of Time," we are enabled to catch glimpses of lovers and libertines, candidates and electors, innkeepers and drunkards, as they lived and dreamed, loved and hated, in the Pompeii of well-nigh two thousand years ago. This wall-literature, which is found in the interior of homes as well as on public buildings, is the work of school children, slaves, soldiers, and idlers. Of miscellaneous character, it includes quotations from poets, doggerel verses, acclamations, insulting and often obscene words, caricatures, catchwords, alphabets, amatory outbursts. Some of these scribblings, which were scratched in the smooth surface of the walls, and hence called by the Italians *graffiti*, were of a religious, while many were of a political, character; but the great majority were purely personal—of so motley a nature, however, as to defy classification.

The great majority of the *graffiti* are in the Latin language; but there are a number in Greek, and a few scribblings, chiefly parts of alphabets and proper names, in Oscan. Among the Greek inscriptions are few complete verses, a single line from Homer, several personal epithets, and oft-recurring alphabets.

Naturally enough, Latin was not spoken purely in Pompeii, being corrupted by the admixture of bad Greek and influenced by the Oscan, traces of which still persist in the Neapolitan dialect. Thus in a *graffito* of the first line of the *Æneid*, written probably by a person having an Oscan accent and not thoroughly familiar with Latin, the

¹ Read at the Classical Conference at Ann Arbor, Mich., March 30, 1905.

² The inscriptions which form the basis of this paper are collected in Vol. IV of the *corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*; some of them are treated also in the works on Pompeii by August Mav, particularly *Pompeii: Its Life and Art*, and in Onebeck's *Pompeii*.

r is replaced by the *l*, reminding one strongly of "pidgin English": *Alma vilumque cano Tlo*.

The Pompeian wall-scribblers, like the modern Neapolitans, seem to have been thoroughly familiar with poetry amatory in character and of the lightest vein. Ovid and Propertius appear to have been most popular; only two or three phrases and broken lines from Virgil are found, and of that author's many verses but a single complete one is quoted. The greatest number of these verses are found in the Basilica, which the better-educated class was accustomed to frequent. On one part of the wall is written *arma virum*, on another *arma virumque cano, Tro*. A line recalling the fifty-sixth verse of Virgil's second eclogue is quoted: *Rusticus est Corydoi* (*Rusticus es Corydon*)—"Corydon, you're a country bumpkin."

The citations from Ovid are mainly from the *Amores* and from the *Ars Amatoria*. Some ingenious person joined and wrote together as one stanza two lines of Ovid's *Amores*, I, viii, 77, and two from Propertius' *El*, V, v, 47, which show similarity of context. Perhaps this was written by a disappointed lover at the door of his *amata's* house:

Open wide to gifts your doors,
But shut for him who but implores;
There, happy swain, enjoy the curses,
Of those turned out with empty purses.
Bid your maid sleep with open eye,
Nor let a generous youth slip by;
But let her sleep through night and day,
If suitors knock who will not pay.

Besides snatches from well-known poets—generally, to be sure, from Virgil and the erotic poets—there are other verses, which remind one but faintly of familiar authors, and there are still others which appear to have been composed by the loungee himself or borrowed from a poetry now unknown. The following tender appeal, made by some ardent suitor to his Daphne or Chloe, shows traces of Ovid or Propertius:

Love indites my halting strain,
Cupid beckons me amain.
Beshrew me if I could depart
Before you pledged me all your heart,
Though I a God might reign!

Another inscription is, with the exception of a slight metrical mistake, a very graceful distich, perhaps a paraphrase or imitation of some popular poet:

Bid him the breezes bind who lovers fain would dis sever,
Or, in its ceaseless play, hinder the fountain forever.

An angry lover writes:

Venus shall feel the weight of my dudgeon,
And her ribs and her head feel the blows of my bludgeon;
For my poor broken heart
I shall make her legs smart;
So hasten, fond lovers, and all take a part.

Very touching in its simplicity and tenderness is the love of two slaves who place themselves under the protection of Pompeian Venus. This *graffito* is found at the entrance to the theater:

Methe, the slave-woman of Minia, who plays in the Atellan forces, loves Chrestus with all her heart, and prays that Pompeian Venus may be propitious to them and that they may ever live in amity.

One scribbler declares, "Love is sweet;" another remarks that no one can be considered a gentleman who has not had at least one love affair. A lover writes: "Victoria, health be to you; and wherever you are, may you sneeze sweetly." Another lavishes his devotion on "Cestilia, queen of the Pompeians, sweet soul." Some one laments, "My heart is overflowing with love." In one spot a lover writes the word "Psyche" in the conventional heart, even yet the true lover's emblem; the heart which encircles the word is formed by the scrolls of the letter.

A very graceful *graffito*, though not metrically perfect, is the address of a lover to his coachman:

Muleteer, if thou didst but feel the fires of love, thou wouldst haste thee more to join thy adored one. Prithee, quicken thy pace. Come, thou hast drunk well; take thy whip and wield it; bring me swiftly to Pompeii where my dear love awaits me.

A curious example of animosity is: "Asellia, rot thee!" Again we find: "Samius to Cornelius, go hang yourself." Someone declares: "Epaphras, you're a bald-head." Again: "Epaphras you're no ball-player." Some Pompeian, perhaps an admirer of Epaphras, drew a line through this unkind remark, but it is still quite legible.

The Basilica and theaters were, of course, the most frequented buildings, and their walls give ample testimony of this fact, as the following from the Basilica attests:

I marvel, Wall, from ruin safe you fare,
Such filthy scribblings all your ledges bear.

In several hostelries situated at the entrance to the town, and intended for the accommodation of peasants of the neighborhood when they came to sell their wares, we find, as in an hotel register, a number of names recorded on the walls of the *cubacula*, or bed-chambers. An instance of marital and domestic affection is the address of a lonely wife to her husband and other relatives:

Hirta a Psacas at all times and in all places sends heartiest greetings to Gaills Hostilius Conops, her husband and guide and gentle adviser, and to her sister Diodata and her Celer; and she sends a greeting to her Primigenia too.

The walls of the wine-shops, like street and house walls, bear *graffiti* containing allusions to the tavern-keeper himself and to his customers. The following was found in a tavern under a picture which represented a soldier handing a goblet to the slave of the tavern: *Da fri(gr)dam pusillum*—"Give me a little cold drink." This may be taken as evidence that the more temperate Pompeians, while not teetotalers, nevertheless used water to mix drinks. A very earnest appeal for a soothing draught, found in the Basilica, comes from one thirsty soul: *Suavis vinaria stilit, rogo vos et valde sitit*—"Suavis is thirsty for whole hogsheads; I implore you, he is powerfully thirsty." To this is added: *Calpurnia tibi dicit vale*—"Calpurnia says, much good may it do you." Still another *graffito* presents the request of a jolly toper for a second cup of the famous *setinum*, or Setian wine: *Adde calicem Setinum*.

The most interesting of these tavern inscriptions is one from Edone's wine-shop, the haunt of the late drinkers:

Edone dicit: assibus hic bibitur; dipundium si dederis, meliora bibes; quartus si dederis, Vina Falerna bibes edone—"Here for a penny one can get a drink; for a tuppence one can get a better drink; if you pay fourpence, you can have real Falernian."

A guest gives vent to his vexation toward a tavern-keeper who sells watered wine, in this pithy couplet:

*Talia te jallant utinam me(n)dacia,
Copo tu ve(n)des acuam et bibes ipse merum.*

Such lies your lips do utter.

Beware them! Landlord mine,

You sell your patrons water

Whilst you yourself drink wine.

There is unmistakable evidence that, even as is the case nowadays, the class of persons who were the habitués of these inns and wine-shops was not the most respectable.

The next class of *graffiti* consists of caricatures. Giving rein to fancy, how easy to invent an amusing story in connection with one Peregrinus, who is represented in a wall-drawing with a conspicuously overdeveloped nose! From the laurel crown that adorns his head it may be deduced that he was some prominent citizen. A wag sketched a similar outline and named it Nasso Fadius (properly Naso), undoubtedly intending a pun.

On the outer wall of a house in the so-called street of Mercury was found a caricature or rough sketch scratched on the plaster by some patriotic citizen of Pompeii to commemorate the squabble between the Pompeians and Nucerians which Tacitus vividly, though briefly, describes in the *Annals*. One would think it a joint production, as the armed figure descending the steps appears to be the work of a more skilful hand than the other two, which are merest outlines. Abortive figures on the left probably represent one of the victors dragging a prisoner with arms bound up a ladder. From fear that this would not be easily understood, the artist considered it expedient to label his production, like a child who writes quite on a par with the drawing. It may be translated: "Companions, you were conquered by the same victory as the Nucerians." From another partisan of the Pompeians we have: "Down with the Nucerians!" From the other side, however, this comes: "Hurrah for the Puteolans! Good luck to the Nucerians! Death to the Pompeians and Pithecusans!"

The epithets applied to gladiators show how popular they were with the ladies, which proves conclusively that the admiration lavished by girls of today on our twentieth-century football hero is but a survival after all. Celadus Threx was "the cause of maidens' sighs,"

and also known as a "Lady-killer," while Crescens was "lord of the lasses."

Not very intelligible nor easy of translation are the following lines, which were written to represent the shape and movement of a snake. The verses praise a certain Septumius, who was probably an India-rubber man or contortionist, and who was said to have enchanted the public by his exhibition of snake-charming:

You who have once witnessed the snake-charming of young Septumius, at which he is a master-hand, be you lover of the stage, or an admirer of horses, I pray you ever keep the scales of justice in even balance.

The translation indicates how unskilful and clumsy the author was in expressing his idea.

The houses and streets of Pompeii, once surging with all the busy life of a thriving town, are tenantless, dead. Yet their former occupants, from their dark grave of twenty centuries, transmit to us a message that in freshness is as of yesterday. The careless scribbblings of idle moments revive for us, with the minuteness of reality, the men and women of these long-past ages; and thereby is opened to our wondering eyes another page in the great drama of human life.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Three questions of vital importance to all interested in educational and social problems are given scientific treatment in an investigation conducted by

DR. KINGSBURY'S
INVESTIGATION OF
THE RELATION OF
CHILDREN TO THE
INDUSTRIES

Dr. Susan M. Kingsbury. The investigation was made for a sub-committee of the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, from whose report we quoted at length in the June number of the *Review*. The questions are: (1) What becomes of the child who leaves school at fourteen; does he gain or lose if he enters business or a trade then? (2) Why do so many drop out at fourteen without even completing the work of the grades? Is it from actual stress of necessity, because their parents cannot afford to keep them in school longer; or is it from a belief that for a successful career the training of shop or store is worth more than that offered by the schools; or is it chiefly for the merely negative reason that the schools do not interest? (3) What changes, if any, in educational methods and facilities are called for to meet the situation.

Teachers and superintendents may have had their opinions on these points, but in the absence of definite, positive, and comprehensive inquiry they are often unable to impress children, parents, and the public with their arguments. Dr. Kingsbury's investigation gives a more definite basis for answering these questions than has hitherto been available. Both homes, on the one hand, and employing establishments on the other were visited. The industrial history of 5,459 individual boys and girls coming from 3,157 families has been studied. Three hundred and fifty-four establishments, representing 55 industries, have contributed to the report from the point of view of employers and foremen. From the families the investigators learned: (a) "the school history of the child—that is the age when he left school, the grade completed, the reason for not continuing longer;" (b) "the industrial history of the child—that is, the various employments in which the child has been engaged, the wages received, and the advance in a single industry, or the change from one industry to another, with the consequent effect on his stability of character;" (c) "the financial and social status of the family;" (d) "the thrift, industry, and ambition of the family;" (e) "especially the attitude of the child and parent toward continued education, and the ability of the parent to afford such opportunities to the child." From employers and foremen information was sought as to "what children were doing, what value their work has been both as to education and as to wage, what has been their stability and their productive value; what opportunity for advancement existed in wage or position; and what better opportunities might have come with better education."

I. WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO THE CHILD TO LEAVE SCHOOL? DOES IT PAY?

Teachers have little doubt upon this point, if the question "Does it pay?" is not limited to money return, but they have not hitherto had the facts for answering this so definitely from a purely pecuniary standard. To answer the question from this standpoint evidently involves a knowledge as to what kind of industry the child enters, and what his chances of advancement are.

What kind of industries then, do children enter who leave school at fourteen? Investigation in various parts of the state, in textile, shoe, jewelry, and commercial centers, shows essentially the same condition. It is not the skilled industries of high grade, but either the unskilled or the low-grade industries which such children enter—33 per cent. in the unskilled, and 65 per cent. in the low-grade. This might be expected when it is considered that, of the children at work between fourteen and sixteen, "only about one-sixth have graduated from the grades, over one-half have not passed beyond the seventh grade, and one-quarter have had less than six years of schooling."

But granting that such children must enter unskilled or low-grade industries, need they stay there? Do not these fit them for success in more remunerative occupations? The answer is: "The fourteen-year-old child enters unskilled industries and remains there" (p. 57). In textile centers the child who enters the mill "stays there universally," "and although the child may bring into the home \$3 to \$6 per week, his older brother, commencing at sixteen, will overtake him in less than two years" (p. 45). In commercial centers department stores offer the most available employment. But the evidence shows that this is not usually a path to promotion. Saleswomen are not taken from cash girls. "That out of 103 girls employed by one firm 72 finally entered factories of low-grade or unskilled work, eight went into offices, and 23 into high-grade work, is evidence of their fate. But that the initial wages in the new industry were \$3 to \$4 shows the uselessness of the years in the store." In the mechanical trades a chart (p. 67) shows forcibly how soon the shop-trained boy reaches his maximum as compared with the boy who has had the training of a technical school.

II. WHY DO SO MANY DROP OUT OF SCHOOL?

The investigation shows conclusively, so far as Massachusetts is concerned, that the reason for the waste of these years is in the majority of cases not the poverty of the parents, but the choice of the children, which in turn goes back to the educational facilities and methods. "Read with the visitor history after history of the child and of the family and you will find that that the child left school from choice, and that the parents objected. Mother after mother declared "we wanted him to stay in school." The theory that the parent puts the child to work as soon as he can is not tenable, except for the lowest foreign element (and even in Lowell almost as large a percentage of the children of native parents are at work as those of foreign parents)." It is not the parent but the child who decides. In the case of children employed in textile centers 66 per cent. could have kept their children in school, and in the commercial centers 85 per

cent. "The class of family seems to have but little to do with the child's dropping-out of school, except when the grades below the seventh are considered. It is age which brings the child the desire to begin to do something. . . . At fourteen he is physically ready, and mentally and morally anxious to cease imitating and to become creative" (pp. 85-6).

III. WHAT EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS ARE SUGGESTED?

Practically no graduates of classical or English high schools were found in the industries investigated—only 382 out of 5,459 children considered had had any high-school education. The manual-training high schools evidently send their graduates into other occupations also—only 52 out of 2,437 manual-training students were found in mechanical trades. The technical high schools fit rather for college and for captains of industry than for skilled workmen. Evidently school work which is to provide better workmen for industries, on the one hand, and retain the children in the schools on the other, must begin in the grades. So far as the employers are concerned it is worthy of note that they are much more nearly unanimous on the value of general education than on that of general industrial or specific trade education. Out of 354 firms 257 considered general education of advantage, 162 considered general industrial, and 158 special trade training of advantage. It is possible that the lower figures in the latter case may be due in part to the small number of children who have had industrial education, and the imperfect quality of much that has been provided.

But from what was said under II above, it appears that the more urgent side of the problem is found in the children themselves. "General education"—if we can properly call "general" an education in which there is so great emphasis on language, mathematics, and formal study as obtains for the most part—does not appeal to these boys and girls who leave school. If we are to hold them we must give them a chance for more creative work. If they are to find the trades for which they are best fitted they must have some opportunity in school to find their talents. If they are to have a true feeling for the dignity of manual labor they must associate handwork of all kinds with skill and intelligent thought, from the early grades on through the secondary course. If the country is to maintain its position in the skilled industries early and continued practice to cultivate manual skill must go along with education in the principles of the trades and technical arts.

Owing to the abandonment of the San Francisco Convention the usual volume of Proceedings of the National Educational Association will not appear. Instead, in view of the fact that the Association completes its first fifty years in July, 1907, a semi-centennial volume will be published, in which will be incorporated: The Proceedings of the Department of Superintendence at Louisville; the special Report of the Committee on Instruction in Library Administration in Normal Schools, recently completed; a revised and completed Index of all publications issued by the Association since

THE SEMI-CEN-
TENNIAL VOLUME
OF THE N. E. A.

organization; a classified list of topics discussed during the fifty years, arranged chronologically by departments; an historical analysis of the work of the Association from 1857 to 1907; a review and analysis of the declarations of principles adopted by the Association at its various annual meetings; statistical tables of membership enrolment, and of annual receipts and expenditures since organization; and other matter appropriate to a volume closing the first fifty years of the Association's history, including a directory of all life and active members of the Association on its rolls at the date of publication.

BOOK REVIEWS

City Government for Young People. By CHARLES DWIGHT WILLARD. New York : The Macmillan Co., 1906.

In 1800 about one-thirtieth of the people of the United States were living within cities having a population of 8,000 or more; in 1900 the proportion had increased to about one-third. Within a few years, if present indications do not fail, more than half of the inhabitants of this country will be living under the jurisdiction of the municipal corporations. It is not strange, therefore, that the subject of city government is receiving at the present time a large amount of attention from students of sociology, economics, and politics.

City Government for Young People, published recently by The Macmillan Co., is a timely contribution in this field; not that it solves, or attempts to solve, any of the perplexing problems of city government, but because it aims to help young people to a knowledge of the facts of the subject which may serve as a basis for intelligent thinking and as an inspiration to greater activity in city affairs. The book is but an outline of municipal government attempting to bring out only those general features found in nearly all American cities. The details of municipal government are so different in different cities, and change so rapidly even in the same city, that it would be impracticable to attempt to deal with them in a single small volume. They may be studied best for any individual city in the charter, ordinances, and reports of the various departments of that city. But this little book is an excellent guide in such studies.

It first traces the growth of cities in size and influence. The relation of the city to the state is then set forth. Then follows the *work* of the city discussed under two general heads, what the city does for itself, and what it does for its citizens. Under the first topic we study the machinery of the city government, the council, the mayor, and the various city departments, and under the second head the real functions of the city, the services which it renders to the individual and to society.

A healthful optimism pervades all the pages of this book. At times, indeed, this optimistic spirit is almost too pronounced; it might almost convince the conscientious political reformer that his calling was no longer a necessary or useful one. We miss, too, at the end of the chapter the familiar "suggestive questions and exercises," and the dignified "bibliographies" which always look well in a textbook and are sometimes used. But the author has sought to make some amends for this omission by tucking away in the back of the book a chapter "To the Instructor," a short but carefully selected list of books dealing with various phases of municipal government, and a batch of quite interesting notes.

Teachers who appreciate the importance of the subject and are trying to equip their pupils with a working knowledge of the institutions of the city in which they live will find this a very helpful book.

EDWARD E. HILL

HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL
Chicago

Course of Study in the Eight Grades. By C. A. McMURRY. New York: The Macmillan Co. 2 vols. Vol. I, pp. vi + 236; Vol. II, pp. 226.

In these two very valuable volumes Dr. McMurry has incorporated the fruits of many years of painstaking, scholarly investigation of the means of betterment of the work of the grades antecedent to the high-school course. Since more than 90 per cent. of all children never secure any school education beyond that offered by the grades, it is of paramount importance that the richest possible opportunities for intellectual and spiritual development be afforded during that stage. There is in progress a tremendous struggle among the utilitarians who demand that the rudiments of business accessories be dominant, the disciplinarians who ask that the best grindstones for wit-sharpening be selected, and the advocates of enrichment who maintain that the child must sample the whole world. In view of the pedagogical chaos respecting desirable content and arrangement, it is fortunate to have a man of scientific training and large insight devote many of the best years of his life to this problem.

The average superintendent, in making out a new course of study, copies blindly the course in some place with a larger reputation. In this way little scientific thought is bestowed upon this important problem, and pedagogical blunders are endlessly perpetrated. In these two books Dr. McMurry turns on the light of pedagogical science, and attempts to study, first, the aims of this stage of education; second, the educative value of various subjects, and the adjustment of means to ends.

In Vol. I the first four chapters are respectively: "Enrichment of the Course," "The Present Problem in the Course of Study," "Economy of Simple Aims," and "Simplification and Organization of the School Course." These titles are all thoroughly indicative of the contents of the chapters. Dr. McMurry shows conclusively that "the leaven of great changes has been at work in the whole social fabric, and has made itself felt also in the school programs. . . . Through the medium of the school the great human world outside, with its institutions and social ideas, is trying to impress itself upon the child. . . . Our present course of study, then, is due to large world-influences, over which the schoolmaster has had no control.

The second volume has four chapters devoted to the discussion of foundation principles rather than to details of the course of study. These chapters are: "The Moral Aim in the Course of Study," "The Problems of Modifying the School Machinery to Meet Modern Needs," "The Teacher *versus* the Course of Study," and "Flexibility and Adaptability of the Course of Study." These chapters belong with the first four chapters of Vol. I, and taken together they form a very illuminating discussion. From a pedagogical point of view it is not quite clear why the general chapters in Vol. II are not incorporated with the related ones in Vol. I. The discussions are not specially related to any particular grade or branch of study.

The remainder of the books are given over to a consideration of the various grade branches, including reading, language, history, geography, elementary science, arithmetic, and the manual arts. The elementary sciences include elementary notions of physics, botany, zoölogy, chemistry, and physiology. Under manual arts are considered sewing, weaving, book-making, furniture-making, tin- and copper-smithing, house-building, cookery, pottery-making, and the construction of apparatus. Besides, a very carefully wrought outline of work for each of the subjects in each of the grades, there are given many suggestions concerning the point of view from which the subject should be taught, and means of attaining these ends. Experiments are suggested, excursions planned, textbooks indicated, and very excellent lists of supplementary

books for pupils and reference lists for teachers are given. These outlines and discussions are much more than would be found in a course of study as usually given in any superintendent's report.

These books should be on the table of every grade teacher, and every superintendent should have them constantly at hand for reference. They would form a very valuable nucleus for discussions at teachers' meetings, and, if worked over for a year or two with the teachers, would certainly contribute much to the unity of work in any school system. They would also serve admirably as textbooks for a part of the work in school organization and school supervision.

FREDERICK E. BOLTON

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Elements of Practical Pedagogy. By the BROTHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

New York: LaSalle Bureau of Supplies, 1905. Pp. xx + 304.

All students of pedagogy will welcome the appearance of this little volume. It is not the work of a single author, nor does it deal with abstract theories. Its aim is eminently practical. It is a body of rules for the conduct of elementary schools, rather than a discussion or a justification of principles; or perhaps we might better say that it is a concise and detailed statement of the methods employed by the army of teachers that constitutes the membership of this society.

It should be remembered that to this community belongs the credit of establishing the first normal schools for the professional training of teachers in elementary schools, and that to them we also owe the grade system. They incorporated into their normal schools primary schools for practice-teaching, where the students received a thorough drill in conducting the simultaneous or class method of recitation. In these three respects, which are now universally recognized as among the most essential features of a good school system, the Christian Brothers were a long time in advance of any other body of teachers in the western world.

At a time like the present, when the cry is going up everywhere against the effeminization of our elementary schools, and when serious-minded people in all parts of the country are endeavoring to find some means of introducing the teaching of religion and morality into the public schools, no educator can fail to be interested in the methods which have been so successfully employed by this splendid organization of men teachers, the results of whose work during the last two centuries have led to the establishment of their schools in almost every country of Christendom. *The Conduct of Schools*, published in 1720, has rendered the idea and methods of St. Jean Baptiste de la Salle and his disciples more or less familiar to all students of education.

The present little volume of three hundred pages is far from doing justice to the important contributions to pedagogy made by the Christian Brothers. It gives the impression of being a synopsis of a pedagogical library rather than a treatise on any one of the familiar themes that are occupying educators at present. The wide range of subjects touched upon renders the treatment almost catechetical in brevity, and leaves no room for the development of any one theme or for the discussion of educational principles. This may have its advantages for members of the order, but it is likely to lead to many misunderstandings on the part of those who are unfamiliar with the spirit and the work of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

The minute details that are entered into in this body of rules are likely to impress the casual reader unfavorably; they seem to render the teachers mere automata, without

individuality or freedom. Such an idea, however, would at once be dispelled by the careful perusal of the volume. In many places it is made perfectly evident that the teachers are expected to continue their professional studies, to read the current literature, and to do their own thinking on educational matters.

Again, the detailed rules and directions for the memorizing of texts might easily lead one to suppose that these teachers practiced the "cramming" system. This impression, however, would be speedily corrected by a perusal of the excellent little article on "The End of Teaching" (p. 48), from which we quote the following: "Instruction is a precise and systematized body of knowledge which the pupil assimilates by personal work: *precise*, for no one is an instructed man who has only vague, obscure, incomplete ideas of things; *systematized*, for to know properly is to know things in their causes, and consequently to link together in the mind principles and consequences, laws and their phenomena; *assimilated*, for true knowledge is nothing artificial, applied to the mind from without or simply stored in the memory, but it consists of systems of truth that become an integral part of the mind, and are organized in it to become as active as itself. . . . The school should prepare its pupils, not for examinations and competitions, but for life. . . . In other words, it is not *crammed* heads, but trained ones, that do the best and most practical thinking."

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Elements of Sociology. By FRANK W. BLACKMAR. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. xi + 454. \$1.25.

Professor Blackmar has brought together his material from many sources, and acknowledges that he is indebted to a large number of students and writers of sociology whose scholarly work and scientific investigations have made the science of sociology possible. His object is to "present a brief outline of sociology, founded on the principles established by standard authorities on the subject." "It is intended to be a working manual for the student."

The book does not possess the originality or unity of Dealey and Ward's books. It is broadly eclectic. On the other hand, it is more practicable as a textbook for beginners, and will serve a useful purpose, not only as a textbook, but for intelligent general readers and social workers who wish to gain a social attitude of mind in relation to all varieties of man's activity.

After a brief discussion of the nature and import of sociology, the author discusses in turn: "Socialization and Social Control," "Social Ideals," "Social Pathology," "Methods of Social Investigation," and "The History of Sociology."

There is a good index, and, at the close of each chapter, references are given, "not as a bibliography of the subject treated, but for comparative reading for students."

A Text-Book of Sociology. By JAMES QAYLE DEALEY AND LESTER FRANK WARD. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1905. Pp. xvii + 326. \$1.30.

This book is an epitome of what Dr. Ward has written. It therefore has the merits and demerits of an epitome. It gives in brief and consecutive form the kernel of Dr. Ward's thought in every field of human activity.

The domains of biology, anthropology, philosophy, psychology, economics, political science, religion, and sociology are all gleaned of their richest harvests to furnish a bill-of-fare for the reader of this book.

Every subject has an historical and logical setting—nothing stands by itself. It follows, therefore, that the book makes great demands upon the reader's power of digestion. Such condensed meat is not for the average student of the high school or first-year college classes. Only those who have had considerable training in the biological sciences, history, economics, and psychology will be able to get much good from the book. To the student so prepared, however, who will read also widely both from Ward's larger works and from other works mentioned in the text, this little book will prove of great value. To him it will give a new and strong sense of unity and continuity in human life and achievement. In him, henceforth, because of his study of this book, will tend to abide a stronger faith in that "increasing purpose" which Tennyson believes to run through all the ages. To such a student also this brief text should come like an individual call to arms in the service of his fellow-men, under the banner of this "increasing purpose."

There is an introduction of five chapters devoted to the claims of sociology to be a science and showing its relation to other sciences. Five parts follow, devoted respectively to: "The Origin and Classification of the Social Forces," "Nature of the Social Forces," "Action of the Social Forces in the Spontaneous Development of Society," "Origin and Nature of the Telic Agent," and "Action of the Telic Agent in Social Achievement."

The authors believe that everything that tends to develop biological structure, or an institution along the same line, is static. Only when the type of structure or institution is changed is the process dynamic. Hitherto these dynamic changes in human society have come about almost entirely through a clash of tribes, races, and peoples. This method is slow, wasteful, and unconscious, like the method of nature in the biological world. It will long continue, but it can be supplemented and finally be largely supplanted by the conscious socialization of human achievement through universal education. The last paragraph of the book reads:

"The action of society in inaugurating and carrying on a great educational system, however defective we may consider the system to be, is undoubtedly the most promising form thus far taken by collective achievement. It means much even now, but for the future it means nothing less than the complete social appropriation of that individual achievement which has civilized the world. It is the crowning act in the long list of acts that constitute the socialization of achievement."

The disturbing query to many who also believe in education is this: How far, after all, do the most, even of the wisest, of us yet act according to knowledge, in comparison with our acts according to physical and social impulse and feeling? A scientific basis for this query is so well stated by Professor Veblin, in the Current March number of the *American Journal of Sociology*, that a part of his last paragraph may well be quoted here for comparison with the main thesis of the book under discussion:

"The quest of science is relatively new. It is a cultural factor not comprised, in anything like its modern force, among those circumstances whose selective action in the far past has given to the race the human nature which it now has. The race reached the human plane with little of this searching knowledge of facts; and throughout the greater part of its life-history on the human plane it has been accustomed to make its higher generalizations and to formulate its larger principles of life in other

terms than those of passionless matter-of-fact. This manner of knowledge has occupied an increasing share of men's attention in the past, since it bears in a decisive way upon the minor affairs of workday life; but it has never until now been put in the first place as the dominant note of human culture. The normal man, such as his inheritance has made him, has therefore good cause to be restive under its dominion."

HENRY W. THURSTON

CHICAGO JUVENILE COURT

School Funds and Their Apportionment. By ELLWOOD P. CUBBERLEY. Published by Teachers College, Columbia University, 1905. Pp. 255. \$1.50.

One of the difficult problems of school administration is that of school maintenance. Adequate instruction calls for a careful financing of the public-school system, and the expense of public education has become so great that only the shrewdest methods should be in control. The indisposition of many to contribute freely to the support of the schools is largely due to the want of adequate returns from their investments. A partial remedy is to be found in "a more general equalization of both the burdens and the advantages of educators." This is the topic studied by the author.

In current pedagogical literature there is frequent discussion of this problem. Such discussion, however, is largely that of personal opinion based on very limited observation. On the other hand, Dr. Cubberley has used a strictly scientific method: he has collected an enormous amount of detailed data relative to school funds. These facts he has carefully studied, and has by them been led to very definite conclusions. The author begins his study with the hypothesis that there are great inequalities in the burden of supporting the public schools, and that these can be much lessened by a modification of the method of distributing school funds.

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 set forth these inequalities. Massachusetts is first taken as a type. It is seen that the burden of supporting schools in various localities is generally in inverse ratio to the means of support, as measured by the wealth of such localities. A study of several other states shows the same relation. If, as is here maintained, the schools are for the commonweal rather than for individuals and for towns, then this situation is unfortunate. These inequalities are largely due to the centralization of population, industry, and wealth. In the larger centers the wealth increases more rapidly than the population. This increases the inequalities in the burden of supporting public schools under present arrangements for distributing school funds.

Chapters 7-12 discuss nine distinct methods of distributing school funds, no one of which is found adequate. That on the basis of taxes, property valuation, or total population has no educational significance at all. The last one is also very inaccurate. All but four of the states and territories take a school census and use this, at least in part, as a basis for distribution of school funds. This is the most common basis used, but is also one of the most defective. This, with the enrolment and average membership bases, is found guilty of "padding" to increase the income. The daily "average attendance" basis approaches that of "payment by results," but it neglects the length of the school term and is otherwise defective. Since the leading expense is the payment of teachers, the number of teachers employed would be a good basis, if used in combination with other methods. This would place a premium on the employment of more teachers.

The constructive portion of this study is in chap. 13, which sets forth a combination basis emphasizing distribution largely determined by local effort and local

needs. Four principles are prominent: (1) "The purpose is not to equalize taxes for education throughout the state, but only to equalize them down to a determined minimum;" (2) "Whatever aid is granted to equalize burdens should be granted only on formal application, accompanied by information as to conditions;" (3) "Such grants should bear some direct relation to the educational efforts made by a community;" (4) "All such grants ought to be regarded as temporary assistance until such needy communities can become able to properly maintain their own schools." The whole study emphasizes helping most the small and worthy districts in special need, but insists upon encouraging local schools to be self-supporting.

This study is too verbose; it abounds in needless repetition; it is cumbered with minute details not essential. Fewer data, more carefully selected, more thoroughly studied and discussed, would have strengthened the work. But, in spite of this, the author has contributed a most valuable work. It should go to every state superintendent, to the committee on education in every state legislature, and to all who may influence the distribution of school funds.

JUNIUS L. MERIAM

TEACHERS COLLEGE
University of Missouri

Argumentation and Debate. By CRAVEN LAYCOCK AND ROBERT LEIGHTON SCALES. New York: The Macmillan Co.

The call for a purely intellectual sport as a foil and an offset to the overwhelming athleticism in our colleges has developed within recent years the intercollegiate debate. As a result, there has been a "growing recognition of the importance of argumentation as a separate subject of study in American colleges." In reality a new subject has been created and added to the curriculum, an eclectic creation made up from fragments of three or four older sciences: rhetoric, formal logic, legal procedure, and oratory. The textbooks that have resulted from this new demand have differed from one another in just so far as they have emphasized one or another of these primary elements. One recent book might be placed on the same shelf as the logics, another might be easily classed with books on court procedure, and still another is but Part IV of the practical rhetoric.

In *Argumentation and Debate*, by Laycock and Scales, an attempt has been made to find a judicious mean between these extremes, to unify the subject, and to make of the four fragments of sciences a distinct art. To what extent they have succeeded opinions may differ, but with at least one who has taught the book to two classes in several divisions the conviction is strong that no new art "demanding investigation for its own sake" has been evolved. The desire for immediate utility dominates the book. It is not logic, or rhetoric, or court procedure; in the last analysis it is a handbook made up of component elements taken from all three, a handbook for the training of intercollegiate debaters. The authors have not realized it, but the decision of the judges has been continually before their minds. The demand of the day is that the department of oratory shall furnish a winning team, and accordingly this book has been evolved for developing debating material.

Parts of the book are excellently done. The chapter on brief-drawing is the best to be found anywhere; the advice in the appendix is practical and helpful. But the book, on the whole, is diffuse. The author takes a page to say: "When you collect

materials, always use a notebook." The whole chapter on preliminary reading could be condensed into three pages, and page after page could be reduced one-half. There is a legal tone throughout. The examples are almost all of them taken from the speeches of lawyers, often in technical points which the average student finds difficult to apply.

Yet with all its faults the book is perhaps the most practical of the compilations that have thus far treated the subject. It seeks constantly for definite results, and in the hands of the skilful teacher it may lead the student to real proficiency in the art with which it deals.

FRED LEWIS PATTEE

STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA

The Elements of Geometry. By WALTER N. BUSH AND JOHN B. CLARKE. New York: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1905. Pp. xii + 355.

It is refreshing to pick up a geometry cast in a newer mold. The authors of *The Elements of Geometry*, Bush and Clarke, have discarded the usual division into books and have arranged the theorems in twenty-six groups. Some idea of the method of arrangement may be gleaned from the titles of some of the groups: the Group of Adjacent and Vertical Angles; the Parallel Group; the $2n-4$ Right Angle Group; the Group of Isosceles and Scalene Triangles; the Group of Congruent Triangles; Group of Similar Figures.

The propositions are placed on the page in this fashion:

IV. 4. *In any triangle the greater triangle lies opposite the greater side.*

An attempt has been made to make the statement of theorems as short as possible. This has not always resulted well, as in the statement: "XXVI-8. The area of a spherical triangle equals its spherical excess." The author is using the right angle as unit. This expresses the area of a spherical triangle in right angles. Many theorems are broken up into several simpler ones, which certainly adds much to the ease with which a secondary pupil reads the book. Another excellent feature is the tabulation of the theorems at the close of each group, a great aid to reference and review. On p. 99 we find a concise statement in symbols of the important theorems on the properties of the angles and lines of a triangle. Scattered through the book are a large number of very excellent theorems and exercises to be wrought out by the pupil.

Symbols are extensively used, giving an open look to the page and a clear-cut and concise look to the proof. Most of the diagrams stand demurely on the page in the orthodox style for a textbook. In solid geometry there has been a pleasing and really valuable intermingling of photographs, plane drawings, and shaded drawings combining the advantages of all and free from the evils due to the exclusive use of any one style.

Among the terms used may be noted: "congruent," "join," "mid-join," "mid-perpendicular," "4-side," "isoangular" (a triangle having two equal angles). A purist in language might object to this last mongrel word, "isoangular," made from Greek and Latin stems. The name "isosceles"—equal legs—is descriptive; but equal-angles is not so fitting. Many of the definitions are an improvement upon those usually given, but others are defective, a few of which may be noted. A line is defined and then the definition is explained. Similar figures are defined as "figures of the same shape," which merely gives another name for the idea, but does not define the

idea; the usual false definition of a prism is given: "A prism is a polyhedron, two of whose faces (called bases) are parallel polygons and whose faces are parallelograms; whereas we know that all figures fulfilling these conditions are not prisms. We also find that unfortunate definition of a limit in which it is said that the variable cannot reach its limit. On p. 2 we find that "a polygon is a portion of a plane bounded, etc.," and that "a quadrilateral is a four-sided polygon;" and on p. 53 "a quadrilateral or 4-side is a figure formed by the intersection of four lines no three of which pass through the same point."

The authors make no distinction between the axioms of geometry and the general axioms, and continue the unfortunate practice of defining a "postulate as a construction admitted to be possible." Nor have they succeeded in steering clear of those common pitfalls, undefined terms, concealed assumptions, unfounded inferences from figures that happen to be drawn. The common practice of founding a theory of limits on that silly postulate: "If while approaching their respective limits, two variables are equal, the limits are equal" leads them to try to prove that the "circumference of a circle [meaning the length of the circumference] is the common limit to which the perimeters of similar inscribed and circumscribed regular polygons approach, etc.," . . . and that the area is the common limit, etc., the treatment is neat and differs from that usually given, but is by no means a proof. This is a case in point where an undefined term, length of circumference, area of circle, is used.

The fact that a great circle arc is the shortest line to be drawn on a spherical surface between two points is a fact of some interest; and, as a pure assumption, should, I think, have a place in elementary geometry. But the authors' attempt to prove it only mars the book and misleads the pupil, if he be dull enough to ascribe any weight to it. The treatment of the "Group on geometry of the sphere surface" is of interest, especially so in connection with the correspondence of theorems and proofs on the plane and the sphere. As a whole the book is well worth examination, and certainly in itself justifies its publication.

BRADLEY POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Peoria, Ill.

CLARENCE E. COMSTOCK

Advanced Algebra. By ARTHUR SCHULTZE. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906.

This book is a step forward in the right direction. In some respects the author has broken with the traditional, notably in his development of the subject from the point of view of the equation. This tends to infuse life into the subject and to do away with much of the purely mechanical work-by-rule. Instead of seeming a meaningless puzzle to the student, algebra thus begins to show a definite purpose and to have a practical application. The practical side is still more emphasized by the numerous applications from geometry and physics and from commercial life which the author has introduced. The emphasis laid on the problems will develop in the student the much-needed power of analysis. An early introduction of the factor theorem in connection with the chapter on factoring would have enabled the author to carry his plan to a logical and pedagogical conclusion, by the introduction, in this connection, of the solution of equations of the second and higher degrees. Thus the student would have become acquainted with one of the most practical applications of factoring which would be of use to him in succeeding chapters. This would keep him in touch with the method of factoring, whereas most students drop the subject as soon as fin-

ished, as is evidenced by the tendency of college freshmen to multiply out all factored expressions.

The use of graphical representation by the author is to be commended, though the graphical representation of the equation as a locus might have been used at least as early as chap. XI on simultaneous equations. More use should have been made of geometrical representations. The parallelism between algebra and geometry could be illustrated in almost every chapter of the book, and this would clarify the ideas of the student and show the correlation of the subjects.

In the treatment of negative and fractional exponents, the author has been successful in showing that these are simply *defined* to be what they are, and why they are thus defined. From most books the student concludes that we *prove*, for instance, that $a^0 = 1$. To begin to familiarize the student early with the meaning and value of a mathematical definition is to be desired.

On the whole the definitions of the book are accurate. The definition of a limit (p. 365), however, is not in accord with that generally accepted by the mathematical world, since according to the author's definition a variable can never attain its limit. The expression "a variable becomes infinite" (p. 366) will give the student a wrong impression of infinity as used in mathematics, and weakens the paragraph in which it occurs. There is also no reason for the introduction of the new symbol S_∞ on p. 344. It is customary to use s_n for the sum of the first n terms of a series and simply s for the limit if such a limit exists.

Why logarithms should have been postponed until the Appendix is not clear. This subject is certainly of more importance to the average student than is that of inequalities, which latter subject has been given a separate chapter. Logarithms should be taken up as early as possible and should then be constantly used. The chapter on imaginaries might have come a little earlier, especially with the excellent geometrical treatment given by the author.

The introduction of considerable oral work would have strengthened the book. One reason why American students are so deficient in the power to compute rapidly and accurately is to be found in their dependence upon paper and pencil in their work. This defect might be in a great measure overcome by numerous exercises to be worked mentally without paper or pencil. The book, however, is suggestive, and the progressive teacher will find in it much that will appeal to him.

H. L. COAR

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The notice here given does not preclude the publishing of a comprehensive review.)

EDUCATION

Elementary Pedagogy. By LEVI SEELEY. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, 1906. Pp. x+337. \$1.25.

The Recitation. By SAMUEL HAMILTON. Philadelphia: J. Lippincott, 1906. Pp. xiii+369.

Der Saemann Monatsschrift für pädagogische Reform. Herausgegeben von der Hamburger Lehrervereinigung für die Pflege der künstlerischen Bildung.

